UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT IN PARTICIPATORY THEATRE FOR EDUCATION

BY

©

JOYCE MILLER

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

DEPARTMENT OF DRAMA

Edmonton, Alberta
FALL, 1992

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-77390-1

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Joyce Pauline Miller

TITLE OF THESIS: Audience Involvement in Participatory Theatre for Education

DEGREE: Master of Arts

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Joyce Miller

#106, 9506 79 Street,
Edmonton, Alberta
T6C 2R9

October 2, 1992

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT IN PARTICIPATORY THEATRE FOR EDUCATION submitted by JOYCE MILLER in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

Jan Selman

David Barnet

Therese Craig
Therese Craig

June 2, 1992

ABSTRACT

This is a study of the levels of involvement experienced by audience members of participatory Theatre In Education and other forms of theatre for education. It focuses on the ways practitioners affect involvement through their choices of form, structure and participatory techniques used within the event.

Chapter I gives an historical perspective on Theatre In Education and its uses in Canada. It outlines types of audience participation as well as the factors that practitioners must deal with when planning a participatory theatre event. Chapter II presents a model of terms for the examination of levels of involvement in Full Participation theatre. These terms are used throughout the study. Research is drawn from published works in the field and interviews with practitioners. Chapter III is a case study of Progress West, a Full Participation drama mounted by the Edmonton Drama In Curriculum team for the Edmonton Public School Board from 1979 to 1982. Chapter IV discusses a second version of the model which describes levels of involvement in Analytic Participation. It includes material drawn from interviews with practitioners. These terms are used in the second case study. Chapter V is a case study of Rap It Up, a play using Analytic Participation which was produced by the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission in 1990. Chapter VI compares the two plays and the styles of participatory theatre they represent in terms of audience involvement and the effects that structure and performers' techniques have on involvement. The study concludes that it is important for practitioners to have a clear understanding of the levels of involvement an audience experiences, and equally important that these

theatre workers have a common language in order to share ideas and learn from each other. The terminology proposed in this study is a step towards that.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ... 1

CHAPTER I

PARTICIPATORY THEATRE ... 4
Theatre In Education and Its Use in Canada ... 4
Types of Audience Participation ... 10
Planning Audience Involvement ... 11

CHAPTER II

STAGES OF AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT ... 13
MODEL #1: Levels of Involvement in a Full Participation Programme ... 13
Discussion of Terms in the Model ... 14
- Interest ... 14
- Engaging ... 15
- Committing ... 16
- Internalizing ... 16
- Reflecting ... 17
- Evaluating ... 18

Use of Questioning to Deepen Involvement ... 20

CHAPTER III

CASE STUDY OF PROGRESS WEST ... 22
The Production ... 24
1) The Pre-Lesson ... 24
2) The Participation Drama ... 27
- Overview ... 27
- Audience Involvement ... 28

3) Debriefing Through Drama: the Post Lesson ... 41
How Structure Contributed to Audience Involvement ... 44
How Performers' Techniques Contributed to Audience Involvement ... 46
Response ... 48

CHAPTER IV

AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT IN ANALYTIC PARTICIPATION ... 51
Model #2: Levels of Involvement in Analytic Participation ... 51
Discussion of Terms in the Model ... 53
- Interest ... 53
- Identifying ... 54
- Desire to Intervene ... 55
- Willingness to Risk ... 55
- Committing ... 56
- Reflecting ... 57
- Evaluating ... 58

CHAPTER V

CASE STUDY OF RAP IT UP 60
The Production 61
    Overview 61
    Audience Involvement 62
How Structure Contributed to Audience Involvement 73
How Performers' Techniques Contributed to Audience Involvement 75
Response 79

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION 84
Structure 84
Performers' Techniques 86
Stages of Audience Involvement 88
    Interest 88
    Engaging 88
    Willingness to Risk 88
    Committing 89
    Internalizing 90
    Reflecting 90
    Evaluating 91
Summary: The Model and Its Uses 92

APPENDIX #1

A Taxonomy of Personal Engagement 94

APPENDIX #2

Moderator's Guide for the Evaluation of Rap It Up 96

BIBLIOGRAPHY 97

INTRODUCTION

I discovered participatory Theatre In Education in 1974, when the Carousel Players of St. Catharines, Ontario, came to my school during their first year of operation. They presented a play about the War of 1812. The audience was seated on mats. We were in groups of thirty, and each group was representative of one of the forces in the war. I was British, and I threw myself into the situation. Every time my side won I was elated, and each time the Americans gained ground I was dismayed. When it was finally over, the troupe pointed out to us that after all the singing and cheering and flag-waving, the border between Canada and the United States was exactly the same as it had been before the war; nothing had been gained, and in the real war, many lives had been lost. That hit me hard, and has stayed with me ever since. The experience gave me insight into the futility of that particular war, as well as an awareness of how easy it had been to become caught up in the excitement of war.

Since then, I have rediscovered participatory theatre a number of times, not only in Theatre In Education (TIE), but in Popular Theatre, in various forms of Theatre for Young Audiences, and even in Theatresports. Whether I am involved as practitioner or participant, my fascination remains in the area of engagement of the whole person. If I had been only an observer of a play about the War of 1812, my response would have been entirely different than it was when I was a "British citizen".

In this thesis, I have tried to look at the participation experience objectively. I am interested in what happens during a valuable audience experience. What are the steps that an audience goes through from the time they enter a room to the time they leave it, feeling satisfied and thoughtful? What do practitioners do that takes them through this journey? To explore this, I developed models that expressed the essential elements of a valuable participatory experience in two forms of participatory theatre for education. I talked with practitioners to refine my ideas about what these essential elements were and to find out the techniques they used in bringing them about. I looked at one production of each of these two forms and charted the audience journey using the terms in my models. Progress West was presented from 1979 to 1982 by the Edmonton Public Schools Drama In Curriculum troupe, and Rap It Up is a show I directed in 1990 for the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission. By concentrating on these, I was able to explore a range of audience experiences while maintaining a focused study. I looked for what the performers and/or practitioners did in each case that encouraged or hindered the audience's progress through the stages. Because I was directly involved in one show and not in the other, I was able to look at the experience from two different perspectives; in the first case, I could look closely at a finished product from a perspective of ten years later, and in the second, I could examine the processes that we used to develop the participatory show while they were still fresh in my mind and the minds of the performers.

I hope that this study will be helpful to practitioners who are willing to take on the challenge of creating participatory theatre.

CHAPTER ONE

PARTICIPATORY THEATRE

THEATRE IN EDUCATION AND ITS USE IN CANADA

Theatre In Education (TIE) was developed in England, growing out of the work in classroom drama begun by Peter Slade after World War II and the work of later practitioners and theorists such as Dorothy Heathcote, Gavin Bolton and Richard Courtney. They felt that drama had an important role in a child-centred approach to education, and they developed approaches to drama that grew out of children's natural patterns of play. Slade's emphasis was on creativity, Courtney's on intellectual development and thought, Heathcote's and Bolton's on moral investigation. In the late 1950's and 1960's, Brian Way applied Slade's principles to participatory theatre for children at the Theatre Centre in London. His plays were performed on the floor in a circular or square playing space, level with the child audience and surrounded by them. The move off the stage was a revolutionary step, as was the central importance given to audience participation. Although the plots were set, they depended on participation that gave the audience the illusion of affecting the action: for example, in "The Storytellers" (Way, Three Plays for the Open Stage, London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd., 1958), the sound of over three hundred voices humming is required to make a magic mirror work.

The Belgrade Theatre in Coventry coined the term Theatre In Education in 1965, when they and the local education authority established a pilot program to use theatre for educational ends. They acknowledge the influence of Brian Way, but they decided to develop their own programmes rather than use his scripts. They aimed to encourage learning by doing as well as watching, and gradually worked out a form where students were given roles and joined the actors in playing out stories. Other theatres and education authorities began to operate teams, and soon TIE grew into a strong movement. Although there are many forms of TIE, most are performed for or with groups of less than one hundred children encompassing no more than a three-year age span, include some form of audience participation, and provide lead-in and follow-up materials so that the classroom teacher can supplement the drama experience. Often, children are involved to the point where they are no longer audience members at all, but are full participants in the event. Programmes may last an hour or several days. Teams are generally comprised of Equity actors with teaching certificates or teachers with theatre training. These people are known either as actor-teachers or teacher-actors, depending on the emphasis of the company. TIE teams flourished through the 1970's, and are still very much a part of the British theatre and educational communities.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, this influence came to Canada through the plays of Brian Way, as well as through workshops led by Heathcote, Courtney, and Way. Children's drama was not new to Canada: classroom drama had been used in Alberta schools since the 1930's. Heathcote's philosophy of using it to explore universal principles and Way's technique of applying it to a theatre event opened up new uses of drama for Canadian practitioners. Between 1967 and 1971, companies producing Way plays included the Globe Theatre in Regina, the Citadel on Wheels/Wings in Edmonton, Young People's Theatre in Toronto, Mermaid Theatre in Nova Scotia, and Montreal Youtheatre. Some began using his techniques in original scripts. The Globe Theatre was founded in 1966 by Ken and Sue Kramer to produce the plays of Brian Way. For six seasons they toured his scripts exclusively, then in 1972-73 Rex Deverell began writing for the Globe and in 1975 he was appointed Playwright in Residence. The Copetown City Kite Crisis (Playwrights Co-op), is a good example of the work he did in adapting participatory theatre for a Canadian audience. It contains elements of Way's type of large-audience involvement set in a Canadian context. It challenges the audience to make a moral decision based on whether progress or care of the environment is more important (possibly a Heathcote influence). The play has two different endings to accommodate the result of a vote which the audience takes regarding this decision.

Other companies developed Way-type Canadian plays during the 1970's, including the Arts Centre Theatre Company (which preceded Alberta Theatre Projects in Calgary), and Carousel Players in St. Catharines, Ontario.

The first ongoing TIE troupe in Canada was established by Don Shipley soon after he became director of Vancouver's Playhouse Theatre Centre in 1971. The Vancouver TIE team's approach was based on the British model. The shows were related to the curriculum, and one or more days were spent working with thirty to sixty children on each project. The team was well-received in the community, and ran under Gloria Shapiro-Latham until 1977, when funding problems forced the company to discontinue the team.

Green Thumb Theatre of Vancouver has a commitment to issue-based Theatre for Young Audiences that has made it a powerful influence on TIE in Canada. Dennis Foon, the past Artistic Director, describes its work as "Emancipatory Theatre" for the young, having ties with Grips Political Theatre for Children in Berlin, the "Free" theatres of Scandinavia, and Theatre in Education in England. (Foon, "Theatre for Young Audiences in English Canada," Contemporary Canadian Theatre, ed. Anton Wagner, Toronto: Simon & Pierre, 1985). Although Green Thumb has concentrated on presentational theatre, Feeling Yes, Feeling No, its participatory show on sexual abuse prevention, has been performed by theatre companies around the world.

There are several groups in Edmonton which have used forms of participatory theatre for education. From 1979 to 1984, the Edmonton Public School Board ran a Drama In Curriculum troupe made up of teachers from the Edmonton school system. Its primary goal was to familiarize classroom teachers with the use of drama as a pedagogical tool across the curriculum. The troupe developed several programmes through its four years of operation which placed the students in-role in dramas related to the curriculum. The first of these programmes was Progress West, a drama about the coming of the first government survey team to Fort Edmonton. It was directed by Susan Burghardt, and toured from 1979 to 1982. Other programmes dealt with the first school in Edmonton and the conquest of the Aztecs by the Spanish.

Catalyst Theatre of Edmonton began producing TIE shows during the late 1970's. The Black Creek Project toured Edmonton and district schools in the spring and fall of 1978. It was sponsored by AADAC (Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission), and was designed to involve junior high school students in an examination of alcohol-related issues. Students were involved in-role as workers and took part in the construction of a model pipeline. The major points in the line of action were set, from a conflict between management and workers regarding low productivity to a climactic alcohol-related accident, but there was flexibility within that for students to make individual and group decisions about how to deal with the problems in the camp. The play ended at the 'hot point' of the accident and then the students and actor-teachers came out-of-role to discuss the problems that had come up and the connection of the problems to alcohol abuse. The discussion was taken into the areas of alcohol at home and teen drinking. The reason given for using this form was that

> through physical participation the students become so intellectually and emotionally involved in the drama that they are able to reach personal decisions about the issues involved, and are stimulated to intense intellectual reflection on these issues once the drama is over.
> (Barnet, The Black Creek Project, 2)

Another Catalyst TIE programme which used Full Participation was Project Immigration. It was first mounted in 1979, and toured several times through the early 1980's. The piece was picked up by Theatre Energy, who toured it in British

Columbia. In it, participants became immigration officers responsible for deciding which three of five potential immigrants would be allowed to enter Canada. Participants were faced with issues concerning race, age, educational level, gender, economic status and political belief.

Catalyst experimented with a new participatory form in 1980, in a show for mentally handicapped adults called Stand Up for Your Rights, directed by Tony Hall. Jan Selman, who was Artistic Director at the time, says that the form grew out of the troupe's research into the needs and interests of the community it was intended for: they enjoy games, they are taught using repetition, and they learn through doing (Selman, Interview, July 30, 1991). Therefore, the performance was set up as a game show. A referee led the participation. Audience members could call "Foul" when the central character in a scene was treated unfairly. The action was stopped, and the audience member could then coach the actor playing the character or even replace them in the scene to deal with the unfair treatment. In It's About Time, a show for prison communities, the central characters themselves asked for advice from the audience. This has come to be called character animation of the audience, and it has become an area of expertise for several artists who have been connected with Catalyst.

The Popular Theatre movement has had an influence on TIE and participatory theatre for education. Popular Theatre is used for the education of people of all ages. It embodies an ethic of education as a co-operative experience between practitioners and audience as they explore life problems together. Its principle is to use theatre to empower people so that they can identify and rehearse ways to make changes in their lives. This has affected the work of Catalyst Theatre and those who have been connected with it.

Jane Heather drew from her background with Catalyst when she wrote Rap It Up, a show for young teens and their parents co-sponsored by AADAC and McDonald's restaurants. Rap It Up toured Alberta and parts of British Columbia through the fall of 1990. Audiences of Rap It Up advised characters on how to deal with the problems they had in communicating with one another.

TYPES OF AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There are many forms of participatory theatre which are used for purposes of both education and entertainment. John O'Toole defines the types of audience involvement used in these as Peripheral, Extrinsic and Intrinsic, depending on how much the audience affects the event itself. Extrinsic Participation is the term he uses for participation which takes place outside of the drama, such as a post-show discussion. Peripheral Participation is physical or vocal participation which does not affect the structure of the drama. Participants who are involved in Integral Participation are able to affect the structure by their actions (O'Toole, Theatre In Education, Hodder & Stoughton, 1976, 89-133). Definitions can also be made on the basis of the role audience members play within the event. In Full Participation, participants are endowed with roles and take part physically in the action. Participation may be Peripheral or Intrinsic in terms of the extent to which it affects the outcome or the structure of the event. Progress West is an example of Full Participation, as is The Black Creek Project. Many events involve audience Out-of-Role Participation, such as Theatresports, where audience members give suggestions which structure the actors' improvisations. Rap It Up takes this a step further, using what I call Analytic Out-of-Role Participation[1]. The audience remains separate from the performers and affects the event by coaching the actors, but the situations presented and the input given are for the purpose of analysing a problem posed within the drama. In Forum Theatre, audience members at some point take on the roles played by the actors in order to work through a problem. I call this type of involvement Analytic Role Play. Forum Theatre was developed by Augusto Boal and described in his book, Theatre of the Oppressed (New York, Theatre Communications Group, 1985, transl. Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride). Second Look Theatre of Toronto is a company that uses this form. In What's Wrong With This Picture?, a play about AIDS, audience members replaced a character in one scene so that they could try their own strategies for convincing another character to use a condom.

PLANNING AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

With each project, practitioners of participatory theatre are faced with the challenge of creating an event which will be valuable to the members of the audience. In many cases, the audience is given, and the show must be designed for them. Other times, it is the topic which is known and it must be decided what type of audience to try to attract to it. Practitioners must keep the needs of the audience in mind as they consider the questions related to structure: Would it be better to use Full Participation or Out-of-Role Participation? What is the dramatic line the story should follow? To what extent should the audience be able to change the course of the action? Should their involvement be limited to choices between alternatives that fit the objectives of the programme, or can it be completely open-ended? Structure includes information sent out before the event, follow-up after the event, and choosing the right setting for the event (or, in many cases, deciding how to deal with the setting given). It also includes the script or scenario itself, and the choice of the type of participation used.

---

[1] Through the thesis, this term will be shortened to "Analytic Participation".

The performers must have the skills and techniques to bring the audience and the piece together. They have the 'on the spot' responsibility for awakening the audience's interest in the event, for making them feel that it is important to them, for making them feel they have a stake in it, and for engaging their power and commitment.

Participatory theatre is risky, for honest participation means that the audience members have power. If they choose not to use their power in a way which supports the drama, the event will fail. And there is no reason for it to succeed if the goals, structure, or performers' techniques do not meet their needs. Therefore, it is essential that practitioners plan audience involvement clearly.

CHAPTER TWO

STAGES OF AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

As practitioners often use many different words to describe the same experience, I needed to establish a unified vocabulary to use in discussing involvement of audience members in Progress West and Rap It Up. To clarify my thoughts, I developed two Models of Audience Involvement based on a taxonomy developed by Norah Morgan and Juliana Saxton for use in evaluating student involvement in classroom drama. This taxonomy is published in Teaching Drama: a Mind of Many Wonders (London, Century Hutchinson Ltd., 1987, 22-28), and is included here as Appendix #1.

The terms of Model #1 will be defined first, followed by a discussion as to how practitioners work with audiences to reach the levels of Involvement defined within it. Then it will be used in my examination of Progress West. The pattern will be repeated with Model #2 and Rap It Up.

MODEL #1: LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT IN A FULL PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME

1. INTEREST: this is essential before any other involvement can take place, and must remain strong throughout the event.

2. ENGAGING: this includes identifying with the roles and the circumstances of the drama. Morgan and Saxton note that participants who are becoming Engaged are willing to operate 'as if' and agree to accept others, places and objects into the imaginary world.

3. COMMITTING: at this point the participant accepts responsibility for the drama and for the group, and accepts the limits of the dramatic situation. Participants become willing to take risks, perhaps taking responsibility to

Participants become willing to take risks, perhaps taking responsibility to change the course of the drama in a congruent way or supporting another participant who does.

4. INTERNALIZING: individuals immerse themselves in their role to the extent that they experience the concerns, beliefs, attitudes and expectations of the role as personal and emotional truth.
5. REFLECTING: the participant applies the distinct situation of the drama to their own life or to their own world.
6. EVALUATING: after the participant Reflects, they determine the value which the events and concepts experienced in the drama can have in their life.

DISCUSSION OF TERMS IN THE MODEL

INTEREST

Practitioners of Full Participation Drama have many means of catching the Interest of participants. Before the programme begins, most TIE troupes send out a prepacket with information which is designed to awaken Interest. Within the drama, providing participants with a 'map' of what to expect will Interest as well as reassure them. Most TIE practitioners believe they have an ethical responsibility to inform the participants of what will be expected of them. Therese Craig[1] feels it is important that practitioners include "early on, some concept within the dialogue that will challenge the child to the problem. Set the problem out clearly and make it clear what their role is in solving it" (Interview, April 22, 1991). Craig lists a number of tactics her troupes have used to awaken Interest, including: a theatrical opening in which characters, plot and the central problem are established; a letter to each participant sent by one of the characters; intriguing set pieces; taped messages; and costume pieces for the characters and the participants to wear. She calls these "Invitations to Participation."

---

[1] Dr. Therese Craig has worked as a practitioner of TIE specializing in Full Participation for many years, first at Siena Heights College in Adrian, Michigan and then in Edmonton at the University of Alberta. She has served as consultant for many projects, including Progress West.

ENGAGING

Practitioners often choose to break a large group of twenty or more participants into smaller groups in order to build a sense of community within which they can feel secure and begin to Engage in the drama. Craig says that in her projects,

> small group work would probably involve some kind of rhythmic action (active participation of the body) that would help them live through a portion of the day in order to build belief in the role with which they were endowed.

Another way to approach this is through in-role discussion designed so that the participants become informed about their roles and the circumstances of the drama through it. Clarifying these makes the participants feel more comfortable about identifying with them, and in some cases it is easier for participants to begin to operate 'as if' verbally rather than physically. Bill Chinn, who directed Progress West in 1980/81 and 1981/82, says the troupe discovered that each group was different as to whether they needed more verbal work or more physical work to become Engaged. Over time the members became very flexible as to which they stressed in each case (Bill Chinn, Personal Interview, January 13, 1992).

Ritual is often used to Engage participants emotionally. In Progress West, the Surveyors and Hudson Bay traders received their equipment and were signed on, the Metis were each greeted in turn by their newly-arrived leader, Gabriel Dumont, and the Blackfoot received their names in a ceremony and chanted as a group.

It is essential that the participants feel enjoyment at this stage, and that the teacher-actors support them so that they grow confident in their ability to participate. If participants cannot Engage in the drama, they will not experience any of the following phases.

COMMITTING

As the drama moves on, individual participants will work at different levels. Some Commit to their role very early and begin to take the risks of speaking and acting in-role. Others may be Interested and acquiescent, but will never move into a full acceptance of the drama. It is important to note that a quiet person may be fully Committed; taking on leadership is not the only way of expressing depth of belief. Teacher-actors use dramatic situations, questions and interactions to encourage Commitment. Craig says that ideally, the drama is

> always working toward the movement of the dialogue from teacher-actor to student and from student back to teacher-actor and from one student to a student from another group. We always knew we were into belief when student began dialoguing with student. Then the leader could get out of the way and the drama could go forth with the leader just having to move in to set the next tension point to allow the drama to develop. Once a child speaks in-role, you know the belief is there.

INTERNALIZING

A participant Internalizes when they take on their role to the extent that what happens to the character impacts them personally and emotionally. They 'take it to heart'. Internalizing does not always happen and is not always necessary to a valuable drama experience, although it gives the participants the feeling that something very special and memorable has taken place, which can strengthen their process of Reflecting. Internalizing can be dangerously mishandled when unskilled practitioners push participants too far into an upsetting aspect of their roles, or do not know how to support them when it occurs. If it occurs, participants must be supported emotionally and given sufficient debriefing to distance themselves again and be able to Reflect on the experience.

REFLECTING

Reflecting occurs within the drama as participants in-role weigh the suggestions and actions of others and consider what they should do next. Practitioners help participants Reflect by asking questions which draw parallels to their own lives. A troupe which is influenced by the work of Heathcote, as the Edmonton Drama In Curriculum (ED DIC) group was, will use Reflecting to "drop to the Universal". In other words, practitioners use

> "what is happening in the drama to remind the group that all through time people have found themselves in the position they are in at that moment, that there is an underlying significance to this event which can be recognized by examining its implications."
> (Wagner, Betty Jane, Dorothy Heathcote: Drama as a Learning Medium. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1976, 76)

Questions and comments by the teacher-actor can act as probes and presses. Wagner defines a probe as:

an attempt at depth or reflection which the teacher throws out in the heat

> of the drama, hoping the class will pick it up. It is called a probe because it is exploratory; the teacher can only follow a hunch that the timing is right, that the class is ready for it. If they reject it, the teacher forgets it for the time being and inserts it in another form later in the drama, again hoping for a response...........
>
> Here are some of the probes I've seen Heathcote use: She'll hold up a dead animal the hunters have just killed and say, "This had to die so I can live." She will stand at the ship's rail and reflect, "This water looks so gentle and innocent and yet it is so strange. I cannot understand it."
>
> (Wagner, 88-89)

If a group responds to a probe, the teacher-actor may press, reinforcing the probe in a way that demands a response:

> In a drama when (Heathcote) asks a farmer how he or she feels about the work, the response might be, "I feel good; I brought in two bags of corn today." Then instead of offering congratulations, Heathcote in role as overseer might provide a press, "All right, but what is the quality of this corn? It is not enough to just bring in two bags, you know.".......
>
> ....She keeps the dynamic of that pressure alive in the situation until the class has had a chance to make new discoveries about themselves as they stretch themselves to endure it.
>
> The purpose of a press, as Heathcote puts it, is to advance a group "into a less well-known and understood territory and a deeper consideration of a situation."
>
> (Wagner,89-90)

Often, actor-teachers will even stop the action at a 'hot point' so that participants can think out-of-role about the implications of what they are doing. Craig recalls that she learned the value of breaking at the dramatic peak when she watched Dorothy Heathcote lead a drama about the Trojan War:

> We were at the point where the kids were all around the walls. They had their hot tar ready to pour on the Greeks when they came in and they had spears ready. The energy and excitement in that room was at a fever pitch. Somebody said, "I can see them! I can see the first horses!" You wanted the drama to go forward but Heathcote said, "Cut!" All of the theatre people, including myself, were saying, "'Cut'? What is she saying 'Cut' for when these kids are so-," but she said, "No. I can't go on and fight a battle with you unless I know these people. All of you around the turrets, why do we

> go to war? Why are we fighting?" Then she went around and got an answer from each one. By the time they got all the way around, it was so beautiful, the type of resolution that they had brought to that moment and to the question. Then she was ready to say, "All right, I **can** fight with you. There they are!!" And the drama picked right up again. We talked about it later. Why did we all feel so frustrated? She was taking an educational step that we thought was going to ruin the theatrical effect and all it really did was heighten it. So I think I've carried that with me, the concept of what happened that day and how theatrical energy can be sustained and re-energized through a type of human, 'myself out-of-role' concept that looks at a universal idea.

Craig notes that if the participants have been deeply Committed, they often do not come completely out-of-role, but remain in "kind of that grey area half in-role and half not in-role so you get something of the kid as well as something of the drama work which they have just done together."

EVALUATING

Evaluating is the only term in my Models where I use the same word as Morgan and Saxton, but with a different meaning. Their definition, which is given in Appendix #1, applies very specifically to classroom drama only. Evaluating as I use it is a process of thought, decision-making, and application to one's own life which takes place out-of-role, out of the drama, and often away from the drama altogether.

Evaluating is usually encouraged in out-of-role discussions after the 'hot point' has been reached. Good use of questioning by actor-teachers is important throughout the drama, but in this area their ability to ask open questions will enable the students to deepen the insights they have gained from the experience.

In many cases, an insight leading to Evaluation will express itself as an 'aha' reaction, one example of which is documented in the videotape of Progress West. A girl says in discussion that she has changed her mind about something: "I always thought that cowboys were good and Indians were bad. But now that I've been an Indian, I think that Indians were good and cowboys were bad." It is difficult to ascertain how much these insights will be applied in real life, but it can be hoped, if not assumed, that such a strong reaction to an idea is an indication of lasting impact.

USE OF QUESTIONING TO DEEPEN INVOLVEMENT:

In this project, questioning was the most significant form of communication between performer and participant. As such, I will note the uses of questioning throughout my case study of Progress West. Questioning was used by the teacher-actors to awaken Interest, to encourage Engaging and Committing and eventually to guide the participants in Reflecting and Evaluating. The types of questions the troupe developed were based on those used by Dorothy Heathcote. They are outlined by Wagner in Chapter 6, "Leading Through Questions" (Heathcote, 60-66). She lists the seven types of questions Heathcote uses as:

> Questions that seek information or assess student interest, including
> Those that define the moment
> Those that stimulate research in books or other documents or call for asking adults for information
> Questions that supply information
> Branching questions, which call for a group decision between alternative courses of action
> Questions that control the class
> Questions that establish mood and feeling
> Questions that establish belief

Questions that deepen insight

(Wagner, 61)[2]

Each of these encourages input from the participants which will actually affect what is happening. Questions are never phrased to imply that the leader knows the answer and the participants must guess. Different types of questions are appropriate at each level of Involvement, but questioning is used throughout. Craig says of an effective question, "It's a probe, it's a tension, it's a challenge, it's a gentle push, a nudge to further thinking and further participation." She stresses that a good question will challenge everyone in the vicinity, not just the person it is directed to.

---

[2] Wagner gives numerous examples to illustrate each type of question and how it works.

CHAPTER THREE

CASE STUDY OF PROGRESS WEST

The Edmonton Drama In Curriculum troupe was established to encourage teachers to use drama as a pedagogical tool across the curriculum. The troupe mounted at least one participatory drama during each of its four years of existence so that teachers could see how they could use drama with their classes. Progress West was the first of these, touring from 1979/80 to 1981/82. It was tied into the Social Studies curriculum for Division II (grades 4 to 6), centring around the tension created when government survey lines were laid through the Fort Edmonton area in the early nineteenth century. The objectives the troupe had for each student participating in Progress West were outlined as:

i) Enabling objectives

1. Becoming actively involved and emotionally committed in an imaginative situation.
2. Speaking fluently and convincingly within an improvisation or imaginative scenario.
3. Actively interacting with the teacher in role-play situations when the teacher might be the catalytic force.
4. Identifying problems both human and environmental that existed within the time-frame of a given dramatic situation.

ii) Terminal Objectives

1. Researching and gathering data pertinent to the people students assume in role-play and their historical environment.
2. Cooperatively solving problems within the dramatic situation and understanding similar problems without role-play.
3. Expressing oneself clearly in reflection of the dramatic experience.
4. Extending the dramatic experience into verbal and non-verbal (art, music, or written) activities.

(Edmonton Public Schools Curriculum Department, Drama In Curriculum Evaluation Report 1979-80, 1980, p.1)

The focus of this thesis is on the participants' experience rather than the attainment of specific pedagogical goals, but it is important to note how the Enabling Objectives affected the structuring of the event. In order to meet these objectives, Progress West was designed to allow maximum student involvement within a set format, with emphasis on each participant speaking in-role. It was intended that every student would speak at least once, and that in a successful performance, students would speak among themselves without prompting from the teacher-actors. This was a primary concern, as the practitioners felt that the ability to speak clearly in-role was the sign that a student was Committed to the drama, and therefore that the groundwork was set for the Enabling Objectives to be accomplished. The project took place in three visits: in the first, the students were introduced to working in-role, the second was an hour-long participation drama, and the third used drama to debrief.

I will use the categories of the Full Participation Model to discuss the audience experience, focusing on the techniques used by the teacher-actors to achieve and maintain the participants' Level of Involvement. I will describe each visit in terms of how it contributed to the participants' overall experience, although I will focus on the participation drama. My observations are based on videotapes of the production made in its first year by the University of Alberta Faculty of Education for Access Television, a videotape made by the troupe members of the production in its third year, the Progress and Evaluation Report, and interviews with directors Susan Burghardt (first year) and Bill Chinn (second and third years), advisor Therese Craig, and troupe members Glenys Berry, Scott Millar and Randy Ritz.

THE PRODUCTION

The troupe supplied schools with a pre-package which gave background information intended to build Interest. It included: a timeline of the events which contributed to the tension; a map of Canada in 1873 showing the route of the railway; and a description of each of the groups involved (the Metis, the Blackfoot, the government surveyors and the Hudson's Bay Company traders at Fort Edmonton), with biographies of their leaders (roles the teacher-actors would assume), and a list of vocabulary words. It was intended that each student would have a basic understanding of the period and of the people involved before taking part in the drama. Of course, the extent to which the material was used and elaborated on would have differed with each teacher, thereby affecting the participants' expectations and initial Interest.

1) THE PRE-LESSON

On the day before the drama, one troupe member led the students through drama exercises designed to build Interest and prepare them to become Engaged in their roles. The University of Alberta videotape: A Teacher Uses Drama to Introduce, records pre-lessons conducted by two different teacher-actors. In each case the teacher-actor introduces the concepts of role, belief, and conflict through an informal discussion, with the students seated on the floor. The empty space signals that something different from the usual classroom routine will happen here, yet the discussion gives them time to become acquainted with the teacher-actor and to contribute ideas before anything unfamiliar happens.

The first activity is individual dramatic movement, done with eyes closed. As the teacher-actor narrates they become Indians sharpening arrows, testing bows and travelling through the forest, and then Surveyors cutting wood and watching for Indians. This exercise has introduced the tension of the situation, awakening their Interest. They have not been defined as individuals, and they have had no verbal input, yet they are beginning to put themselves into the roles of other people from another time. On a very basic level, they are beginning to Identify with roles, which is an element of Engaging.

They are taken out-of-role to discuss pictures of the four groups which will be represented in the drama, then become Indians once more. The teacher-actors take on the role of Chief Crowfoot, and discuss the buffalo hunt with them. At this point they still contribute only one or two-word answers to simple questions. The leaders change roles and become Chief Factor Hardisty of the Hudson's Bay Company, and negotiate a trade with the Indians. They begin to treat the students as individual characters, remarking that one is a good hunter, that the price sought by another is too high. An exchange between Ms. Berry and one of the students illustrates how the teacher-actors deepen the level of Engagement:

> FACTOR: Why did you not bring pemmican with berries? You usually bring me pemmican with berries in it.
> STUDENT: We need it.
> FACTOR: Are times that bad?
> STUDENT: Yes.
>
> (U of Alberta tape)

She asks a question which demands more than a one-word answer, then accepts the student's response and uses it to deliver more information: times are hard for the Indians. She phrases this also as a question, and the student answers with more conviction. The teacher-actor's demonstrated faith in the student's ability to play the role has increased the student's faith in herself. As the teacher-actors continue this interaction, the students become more Willing to Risk, so that they already have achieved a level of Identification before the participation drama starts.

At the end of the pre-lesson, the teacher-actors give a letter to each student from the historical leader of his or her group, thus extending a concrete, personal invitation to participation. The letter gives the student more information about the situation, as well as a name and a relationship to the leader: each of the Blackfoot is chief of a tribe, each Surveyor has been specially sent out by the government, and so on. The roles are high status, challenging, and interesting: tomorrow will bring an adventure.

2) THE PARTICIPATION DRAMA

OVERVIEW

The historical setting of the Participation Drama was at a time of very high tension in the Fort Edmonton area. Government surveyors had just arrived to map out railway lines, and controversy and rumours had preceded them. Many who lived in the area feared the changes that a railroad would bring, yet others felt that this was important progress.

The four teacher-actors were in-role as Blackfoot Chief Crowfoot, Metis leader Gabriel Dumont, Chief Factor Hardisty of Fort Edmonton and Government Surveyor Sandford Fleming, representing the four major groups who were affected by the changes. The students were members of these groups.

As the drama began, each group went through a quick, in-role review of the situation from their point of view. The structure of the drama was very loosely-set, and focused on each group's encounters with the others. In the first year, it almost always built to a 'hot point' where the Blackfoot and Metis prepared to attack the fort, but in later years the structure was made more flexible, so that the attack only happened if the students really seemed to want it and if they initiated it. Bill Chinn, who directed the production in its second and third years, said that he felt this hot point was often rushed. The whole thing had to be finished in one hour including debriefing, so sometimes the leaders had to push to get the students to buy into taking such a drastic action. This was at odds with the group's intention of giving students power within the drama, and since the focus was on exploring the feelings of the people involved, the climactic ending was let go. He said that if necessary, it was played out in the post-lesson (Interview, January 13, 1992). Throughout the drama, the Surveyors' stakes and lines were used symbolically. To the Surveyors, they meant progress; to the Blackfoot and Metis they were physical intrusions on their land, representing a threat to their way of life. The drama ended with a short scripted scene where Crowfoot agreed to a treaty and accepted a survey stake from Fleming before he moved into an area designated as the Indian Reserve.

AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

The opening of the Participation Drama was designed to build upon the Interest which had been awakened the previous day. Randy Ritz says the Pre-lesson worked well in this regard: when the first teacher-actor entered the classroom, "the students were primed. They knew something was about to happen. You'd come in in costume and it was magic" (Interview, Aug. 29, 1991). As they were led to the space where the drama would take place (usually the library or an empty classroom), they were encouraged to enter an imaginative situation:

> Scott (Millar) used to do some great things. They'd sneak down the halls. So while the kids were going, they'd be in-role, creeping down the side of the hall, by a creek or in the woods. When they got to the door, he'd open it and announce them: "The people of the Blackfoot" (for example), and they'd come in as a group. They didn't know what was on the inside.
>
> (Ritz)

The lights inside the room were dimmed where possible, and the smell of the smoked leather moccasins worn by most of the characters filled it. The Blackfoot leader drummed. The teacher-actors, in-role as Blackfoot Chief Crowfoot, Metis leader Gabriel Dumont, Chief Factor Hardisty of Fort Edmonton and Government Surveyor Sandford Fleming, met each of their groups and seated them. A seven-minute theatrical opening followed, where each of the characters outlined the situation from their point of view. Ritz says that since the students had already met their group leaders, this segment allowed "a strong form of participation by association. They saw what we thought of each other. Then when we came back, they adopted the attitude, the belief of the leader." This was their 'way in' to the attitudes of the people they were to play.

After the opening, the students joined their leaders in small groups seated around the room. At this point the participation was designed to be low-risk while moving them into Engaging. Costume pieces and ritual were used to build belief: the Blackfoot received leather medallions in a ceremony, the Metis swore an oath of allegiance to Dumont as he tied on their belts, the Traders were told, "We know this land well," as their neckerchiefs were tied on, and the Surveyors heard of the glories of progress as they received their cords and stakes. The University of Alberta videotape shows the Metis being 'reminded' by Gabriel Dumont of the last time he met them, and of his admiration for their skillful hunting and horsemanship. They are already angry, volunteering information about their poor buffalo hunt, as opposed to the great hunts of the old days. The teacher-actor's energy and commitment to her role feeds their excitement about being part of this group. As well as the students who give the information, others respond vocally and sotto voce with excited "Yes" and "No!" Ritz notes that it was important to work at direct connection with each student while making sure that they did not feel pressured:

> If I saw any of them draw back, I might offer them a gentle question, and say, "Do you bring greetings from your tribe?" That's a yes/no closed question, but there's nothing wrong with a closed question at that point, because you just want them to feel confident. Whatever they say is fine. For those that are more eager, you might say, "Tell us, how many buffalo have your people killed?," so they can invent, "Twenty-seven buffalo." "Tell me, where were they, how did you do it?," so they would get right into telling the story.

The next step in Engaging the students was to involve them in a task within their group. The Blackfoot erected a mime teepee, the Traders loaded supplies into the Fort, the Surveyors and Metis began scouting the area, each for their own purpose. The videotape shows that the teacher-actors took advantage of the students' natural interest in the activities of the other groups: when the Blackfoot pass on their way to the Fort, the Metis are told that they must hide silently behind the trees to avoid being seen. Fleming remarks to his men on the fact that the Metis are on the move. This is the stage of 'rhythmic action' that Craig speaks of, involving the body so that it is easier for the mind and emotions to become Engaged. Chinn notes that as the tour went on, the teacher-actors became sensitive to the amount of time each class needed to spend in this type of activity. By the third year, some classes would spend nearly the entire time in this, while others would go almost immediately into in-role discussion.

The programme was structured to allow at least two interactions between each of the four groups, although the number could vary. The skilful handling of these interactions was essential to facilitating the step from Engaging to Committing.

As the class on the tape nears the end of the group work, most of the students are becoming Engaged. They are showing willingness to operate 'as if,' they are accepting the people and objects around them as parts of the imagined world, and are ready to take the step into Committing, accepting responsibility for the drama. Others have not reached that stage. The differing levels of Involvement among the various students are shown clearly in a confrontation between the Surveyors and a Metis messenger (I will use role names to simplify reference to the group involved):

> FLEMING: Where do you get your food from?
> METIS (Student): Buffalo killing.
> FLEMING: We don't kill buffalo.
> METIS: You are bringing white men in trains. They kill.
> FLEMING: Smith, answer.
> SMITH: There are no trains yet.
> METIS: They will come.
> FLEMING: You have seen the trains in the East, have you, Isadore? Tell them the good things the railway will bring. Tell them (Nudges "Smith" forward).
> SMITH: Crops and food.
> FLEMING: What will you do when the food runs out?
> METIS: We will figure that out when we come to it.
> FLEMING: We want to help now.
> METIS: You kill the buffalo.
> FLEMING: How many buffalo have we killed? Tell them. Tell them.
> SURVEYORS: None.

It is clear that the student in-role as Isadore, the Metis, is Committed to her role. She speaks confidently, and argues the Metis position as if it were her own.

"Smith" and the other Surveyors still require prompting from their leader, and Smith's responses are those of a student searching for the 'right' answer rather than a Surveyor arguing with an outsider. This difference may be due in part to different personalities. Also, the Metis is a messenger, which implies that she has been briefed as to what message to carry to the Surveyors, or what information to get from them, while the Surveyors are being prompted on the spot. She has been entrusted with a personal responsibility for her group. As a result of the trust her leader has shown in her, she is beginning to work at the third Level of Involvement, Committing; she is accepting responsibility for the drama and taking risks within it. The Surveyors feel none of this responsibility as yet. They seem to be taken by surprise when their leader expects them to answer rather than doing it for them. At this point the Metis as a group appear to be working at the highest level of Involvement among the participants, and the rest of the Metis group advance into Commitment when they join this encounter.

> DUMONT: What have you discussed?
> METIS: Bringing the railway.
> DUMONT: What will these settlers eat?
> SMITH: Food they grow.
> METIS (ANOTHER STUDENT): They still eat meat!
> DUMONT: That's right! It will be many years before they can raise cows on this land.
> FLEMING: There will be farms for the Metis.
> DUMONT: Farms!

A cacophony of in-role unrest arises among the Metis, as they echo their leader's disdainful, "Farms!," and throw in comments such as, "We were here first!" In the opening 'storytelling' work of the teacher-actor, she had informed them of the government's insulting offer to give farmland to the proud buffalo hunters, and now this preparation pays off. The students immediately latch on to the word, "Farms," and it propels them into an emotional Commitment to their roles. Their emotion carries the Surveyors into Commitment, and now many of these students are speaking and reacting in-role. The Traders see this exchange from the fort and the teacher-actor uses it, telling them to be prepared to open the gates for the Surveyors if they need help. The angry Metis decide to do their trading, and the students' mime is very clear as they carry furs to the fort. Although they have differing levels of technical ability, their loads have well-defined weight and size and they carry them without self-consciousness. Interaction with the Metis brings the Traders' level of Commitment up: as they conduct their trade in an atmosphere of high tension, Dumont makes use of the uncertain answers of the Traders to accuse them of lying. This incenses the Metis and forces the Traders to defend themselves, Engaging them emotionally. Glenys Berry feels that this was

> an ideal interaction...because it was so task-oriented. You're dealing with the furs and whether or not they are good furs. So you had a great chance for task and conflict... The kids would inevitably get a chance to speak, and the more they could speak, the more they'd drop into role.
>
> (Berry,1991)

When the moment is about to break down into confused shouting, Dumont removes the Metis, saying, "Do not argue with these men anymore. They used to be our friends!" In-role discipline works very well here; it restores order while feeding the emotion. The Metis are told to leave, but their anger is validated. It is the Traders who feel chastised, which fuels their resentment against the rowdy

Metis. As they go, a Metis student discovers the survey lines which have been laid out in the meantime, and points them out to Dumont. Dumont asks if they should tell the Blackfoot, and the Metis passionately answer, "Yes!" The teacher-actor has made a suggestion, but made them feel that they have a responsibility about where the drama goes. Blackfoot and Metis enter into a very animated discussion as to the pros and cons of going to war, and Dumont assigns one student the task of watching the guns. His failing conviction is bolstered when Dumont turns out from the discussion to ask him, "Do you see anyone?" Just at the point where he was beginning to feel like a kid left out of the fun, this remark sends him back into role, and for as long as he is on camera, he is concentrated and alert.

The Traders appear to have the hardest time maintaining Engagement and reaching a level of Commitment. They achieved it briefly while dealing with the Metis, but now they are unloading incoming York boats, and their mime is weak compared to the other groups. Hardisty calls a welcome, and one student shakes the hand of an invisible voyageur with a self-conscious grin on his face. It appears on tape that the drama for the Traders is following a different structure from that of the other groups. Where the others have been actively involved in debate about highly volatile issues, endowed with a sense of mission with regards to bringing progress or protecting the old ways, and/or involved in concrete work such as the laying out and discovery of survey lines, the Traders are still involved in the sort of rhythmic action which the others surpassed much earlier on. Presumably the troupe has planned that there is some tension related to this activity, but the students have not picked it up. Their concentration is on the task rather than the role or the situation, and they are very much themselves. On the tape it appears that the structure of the Traders' drama has hit a peak with the Metis trading, and has dropped down again into rhythmic action, whereas the other groups are involved in situations of steadily rising tension, and are remaining interested in and committed to their roles.

Bill Chinn points out that the teacher-actor playing Hardisty was very new to the troupe when the videotape was done. As she gained experience, or when other teacher-actors took the role, the experience for participants could be quite different. It was difficult for a new teacher-actor to make the role really come alive when its dramatic structure was not as clear as for the other groups, but Ritz feels that the potential for tension in the Trader role was high:

> It had to do with questioning in-role: "What problems did you have getting out here?" Then you talk about all the problems. Falling in the river. Bears. You can add a lot of dramatic elements. Everyone's coming to the fort. They're getting a lot of stimulus. They're at the centre of things. At the end, very often the others would surround the fort. And they'd be caught in the middle, with the sense of being trapped.

Millar says that although sometimes students would feel that some of the other roles were more romantic, there were times when "the fort was everything" (Interview, December 4, 1991).

Berry feels that the Metis and Blackfoot groups were the easiest to Engage in their roles:

> No matter who took the Metis or Blackfoot leadership role we found that in

> those two roles the kids did in fact get greatly committed, because it was such an emotional base.[1] They had so much to lose. It was easy to grab on to, as a leader, to pull them into the injustice. And the ritual (of the Indians) is powerful. It takes them right down into a depth.
>
> (Berry, 1991)

Berry does note that she most enjoyed playing Dumont, and Ritz says that he was not as happy playing Fleming as Crowfoot, until he discovered he could play Fleming "as a klutz who got them into trouble, and it was up to the men to get me out of it." These observations show the importance of the empathy the practitioner, as the lead character, has with their role, as well as implying that some of the roles had a natural 'hook' for empathy, such as the Blackfoot and Metis, while for others, the practitioner had to be able to find what is engaging in the role and make that real for the students. Craig says that acting technique is not nearly so important for a teacher-actor as is the ability to believe in the role and in the situation. The participants pick up on the Commitment of the leader. Ritz's discovery was a way to help the Surveyors to Commit quickly; they had to be responsible for their group.

The tension in the version documented in the University of Alberta tape hits its highest point when the Blackfoot and the Metis decide to join together and declare war, whereas the tape of the third year shows an instance when the drama did not get that far. In it, the students are having councils between the groups when the troupe proceeds to the scripted ending. In the 'war' version, the students are questioned by their chiefs about their decision to make sure that they understand its seriousness, then the action moves quickly. The Blackfoot begin a war dance to warn the enemy, the Metis pull up the survey stakes, and the Traders open the fort to let the Surveyors in. When the fort is surrounded, Hardisty encourages two Traders to stand on the towers and tell the natives that they all can share the land. Although they have been caught up in the excitement, she feels it necessary to prompt them to speak and tell them what to say. The Surveyors also speak on cue, but given the responsibility they speak confidently and in their own words:

---

[1] The teacher-actors changed roles at several points during each nine month tour.

> HARDISTY: Tell them we can share the land.
> DUMONT: We want to know why the Hudson's Bay Company protects these men!
> FLEMING: (sotto voce) Speak, Hine.
> Wait! Hine wants to speak. Speak up, Hine.
> HINE: We will not enter your land, or kill your buffalo.
> METIS & BLACKFOOT: Lie! Lie!
> HINE: As soon as we are done, we will leave.
> METIS & BLACKFOOT: Lie! Lie!
> DUMONT: We have made a decision. You will leave now!
>
> (U of Alberta Videotape)

At this point, the students all begin shouting, and a member of the troupe calls, "Freeze!" The students are seated, and the teacher-actors tell them they are taking the action seven years into the future. Each of the leader characters finishes with a brief monologue telling what became of him and his people. They close with the line, "The drama is over," and the students return to their groups for out-of-role discussion so that they can Reflect on and Evaluate their experience.

The discussion groups are not given equal coverage by the University of Alberta videotape, but it is valuable to look at, as the members of the Metis group give evidence of having Internalized their roles and come to new understandings. Their discussion has the urgency of discovery to it, an urgency shared and mirrored by the leader, while the Traders answer factual questions which explore nothing that is new to them or to the teacher-actor. Excerpts from the discussions illustrate the differing levels. I record them here in the order in which they appear on the tape, with broken lines to show where the tape cuts to another group. Although the teacher-actors are now out-of-role, I will refer to them by their character names for consistency of reference.

> HARDISTY: The Hudson's Bay Company changed from what to what?
> STUDENT/TRADER: To The Bay.
> HARDISTY: From a fort to a shopping mall. Excellent.
>
> --
>
> STUDENT/METIS: Where we're sitting right now, it might have been Metis land!
> STUDENT: Where we are right now. They might have been us!
> OTHERS: Yes!
>
> --
>
> HARDISTY: What was the important natural resource at that time? (long pause)
> STUDENT: Furs.
> HARDISTY: Furs were the resource.
>
> --
>
> DUMONT: Definitely. A buffalo probably was standing right here.
> STUDENT: And now look at the city. Pollution, everything.
> DUMONT: Does that make you feel worse about it, does it make you feel sad?
> STUDENTS: Yeah, yeah.
> DUMONT: But, would you be here?
> STUDENTS: No. No.
>
> --
>
> HARDISTY: We have a natural resource today where the same sort of thing could happen. Which is it?
> STUDENT: Gas.
> HARDISTY: Gas and...
> STUDENT: Oil.
>
> --

STUDENT/METIS: We could have shared it with the Indians.

FLEMING: What happened to the Indians? Where do they live today?
STUDENT/SURVEYOR: On reserves.

STUDENT/METIS: Now I feel bad about seeing that movie the other day. The Indians are supposed to live better today. But when you really think about it, they're living worse.

FLEMING: Do you think the changes we brought were all good?
STUDENTS: No.

DUMONT: What were they angry about?
STUDENT: Progress.
DUMONT: Change. What would they have to change?
STUDENT: They'd have to change their way of life.

STUDENT/METIS: I'm not sure about this, but I always thought cowboys were good and Indians were bad, but now that I'm an Indian, I think the Indians were good and the cowboys were bad.

Discussion clarifies the experience, and insights may be gained which otherwise would be lost in the action of the drama. The children in the Metis group are genuinely excited about things which they are seeing for the first time. Their interest here indicates the depth to which they identified with their roles. Their comments show "the intimate interplay between personal feeling and thought and empathetic feeling and thought" which Morgan and Saxton say is characteristic of Internalizing (Drama, 24-25). The thoughts and feelings they experienced in-role have affected their real thoughts and attitudes, and the teacher-actor is supporting them in this. The Surveyor group is only shown twice, but the line of questioning seems to be leading them to Reflect on their experience. The group having the most superficial discussion were also the ones which showed the least

Commitment. Their leader had trouble finding the 'actor' part of 'actor-teacher' in the drama, and that difficulty continues in the discussion. She maintains a distance from the drama and the people in it that make it difficult for the students working with her to feel anything strongly about it. Her questions imply that she knows the answers and they must guess. She rewards a correct answer with, "Excellent." Bill Chinn says that later on, a strategy for questioning was developed so that all groups would have a similar experience in the discussion. The first round of questions would be about how they felt in-role. In the second round, questions were about the real people who had lived through the situation. This would signal to students that it was time to withdraw from the roles and look at the context. The final round would encourage them to Reflect on the significance of this event historically and its effects today, based on what they had discovered by 'being there'.

Some of the Metis students give evidence in the discussion segments quoted above that they are Evaluating their ideas about Indians 'on the spot'. They are changing their opinions as they speak. This may not have happened as dramatically with all participants, but that does not mean they did not Evaluate the experience and apply it in their lives. Ritz notes the ongoing nature of Evaluating:

> What is lasting might not even be a cognitive kind of rationalization of all of the things that were happening. They might not intellectually understand all of the ramifications, but emotionally they understand the loss of the people. If you ask an open-ended question and you get wonderful answers back you feel great; it's immediate gratification. But I think it's a growing process. They'll keep learning, because it triggers, they'll go back to that experience anytime they read anything about Fort Edmonton.

3) DEBRIEFING THROUGH DRAMA: THE POST LESSON

The final visit of the programme took place one week after the group drama. Its student-oriented goals were: to complete the story beyond the point each class had reached within the drama, to examine the historical event from angles not covered in the drama, and to continue Reflection and Evaluation through sharing information between the groups. Although the format was changed several times through the run, the changes were mainly geared to encourage more involvement by the classroom teacher; so I believe the early example shown on University of Alberta Videotape #3: A Teacher Uses Drama to Debrief, is a good indication of the student experience throughout.

The tape shows the same students as in Tape #2, so it is possible to follow their experience. The teacher-actor opens with a brief discussion, and then has the students return to their groups to create tableaux that express the feelings they had at certain moments in the drama. They choose one of these to show to the other groups. Following this, she asks them to think of the one question they want most to ask one other group. This arouses a lot of excitement and interest. A girl who played a Blackfoot demands to know whether or not there was smallpox in the fort. She suspects the Traders told her people this to keep them out, because then they had let the Metis in to trade. A number of students join in heatedly to back her up in her suspicion or to defend the Traders. Their anger is the anger of students still identifying with their roles: Commitment, and some Internalizing, is still easy for them to access one week later. The leader has to remind them that they are discussing this as themselves.

She asks if they would like to use drama to explore why Crowfoot signed the treaty after he had fought so hard against it. She has made the suggestion, but leaves it to the students to approve it. If she is honest in this, she will have alternatives ready. The students agree, because this is something that has puzzled them, and they are placed in-role. She uses the low-risk technique that she used in the pre-lesson: they stand alone, and merely think of themselves first as North-West Mounted Police seeing the land for the first time, and then as Blackfoot Indians looking at it for the last time. They spend most of the session in exercises where they alternate being in-role as police or as Natives so that they can explore both points of view.

The session ends with a tribal council where Crowfoot announces his decision to sign the treaty. The students have difficulty at first coming up to the level of emotion shown by the teacher-actor playing Crowfoot. Perhaps because they have been switching roles, it takes them a few minutes to settle in to this one, but they volunteer information in-role as well as answering questions. Their Commitment grows through the course of the debate. The teacher-actor chooses a student who had shown strong Commitment in the last visit to be Red Crow, a chief who opposed the treaty. The student Red Crow eventually decides to sign, and Crowfoot asks how many will join them. About half stand to show their support. The teacher-actor then applies what Heathcote calls a 'press'. She escalates the emotional demand on the students. They must make a decision one way or the other, and make it strongly. She asks Red Crow to convince them, but only a few more stand. Crowfoot shouts that all who will not sign the treaty must leave, and that they will no longer be Blackfoot. Half the students leave the circle. The other half remain. The student who realized a week earlier that Indians are worse off today than in the old days is one of those who leave. She encourages a friend to go with her. This indicates that she is using the drama to Evaluate her ideas about Indians and what the treaty meant for them: she is now acting on the impression which was new to her in the Participation Drama. At this point the teacher-actor freezes the action. The response is a spontaneous outburst of, "All right!," "That was cool!" This is the final step in the Morgan-Saxton taxonomy of classroom drama: "Communication - satisfaction in the shared significant experience" (Drama, 27). Obviously, the leader's decision to press was a good one. It put the students into a position where they felt that something very important was happening, and they became deeply Committed to their roles very quickly. Once released from the roles, they felt good about what they had just experienced.

She asks whether they felt more empathy for the Mounted Police or for the Indians. The students agree that even though they were sincere in their wish to help as Mounties, their emotions as Indians were stronger. This is probably a result of her 'press', which pushed them much more deeply into the emotional experience of the Natives. None of them feels certain that Crowfoot made the right decision, looking at it from 1980, but they do feel that he did what he thought best, even if they had disagreed with him while they were in-role. Ritz points out that the troupe stressed the affective experience of understanding how people felt, rather than learning or debating facts. The last moments of the tape show evidence of the students' continuing Interest and Evaluation. After the teacher-actor has dismissed them, a student comes up and says, "We couldn't have stopped the buffalo slaughter, but we hurried it up." She feels this is an insight that must be shared, even though it is a point which was hit more directly in the drama a week ago than in the work today.

HOW STRUCTURE CONTRIBUTED TO AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

The three-part structure of the show was one of its great strengths: it allowed the students time to work their way into the drama and then into the issues they had to deal with, and finally to pull back and debrief. Within the pre-lesson the students became familiar with role playing before they began the participation drama. Having then gone through the group drama, they were able to use role play for the purpose of Reflecting on the third visit. The goals of the programme were clear, and the steps to achieving them were clearly defined. Each teacher-actor had specific skills and vocabulary to teach in the pre-lesson and each was familiar with the steps the students would go through in the group drama from audience to rhythmic movement to verbal interaction with the leaders and then with each other.

The structure of the participation drama let the students start off in a passive role and become more and more active and effective. This structure worked well, especially as the troupes and the individual teacher-actors became more skilled at deciding how much time each class needed to spend on each level of activity. The theatrical opening and the storytelling at the beginning built up the students' Interest. The first rounds of in-role questioning, ritual and rhythmic action built belief and Engaged the participants physically, mentally and verbally. Interactions between the groups built Commitment as they had to argue their own points of view and figure out how to deal with each other. The major structural weakness in the first year was the lack of dramatic build for the Traders' role. This problem appears to have been overcome by the work of the teacher-actors in finding the tensions in the role and in keeping the Traders' work integrated with what was happening in the other groups. Building the action to a hot point, whether that was storming the Fort or having a council of war, and then debriefing it, gave each student a chance to Reflect. In the second and third years, students in the post-lesson each had to give a reason why they would or would not sign the treaty offered by the government. This gave the students a chance to learn from each others' points of view and to clarify their own ideas. Finally, the out-of-role discussion was an opportunity for the teacher-actors to challenge the students to Evaluate what they had experienced, and to begin to draw insights from it. As a standard discussion format was developed through the years, there was less chance that some students would end the drama with the type of historical information quiz we saw the Traders go through in the University of Alberta tape.

In-depth debriefing through discussion and in the Post Lesson was what director Susan Burghardt feels was "the most important part: the way to find out if they have had the experience" (Burghardt, Interview, April 23, 1991). There was ample time for Reflecting and Evaluating.

Also significant was the careful lead-in and follow-up work. The troupe intended to teach the classroom teacher to use role play as a pedagogical tool, so that the experience would be supported by ongoing dramatic learning. Therese Craig recalls that one teacher spent the rest of the year developing and investigating the roles of Blackfoot, Metis, Traders and Surveyors, at the insistence of her class (Craig, 1991).

HOW PERFORMERS' TECHNIQUES CONTRIBUTED TO AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

Questioning was a central technique used by the teacher-actors in Progress West. While planning the show they studied Heathcote's categories of questions, and they continued to refine their questioning skills throughout the three years of its run. Questioning was an important strategy for awakening first Interest through to encouraging final Evaluation. Open-ended questions gave at least some power to the participants and in the best cases, made them responsible for working out problems and continuing the drama. Questions built belief in the early stages by encouraging participants to tell stories, as when a teacher-actor asked, "How was the buffalo hunt this year?", and challenged them to Commit by giving them the power to decide what to do next: in the tape of the third year, Fleming breaks down at a moment of crisis and says, "What are we going to do? Give me an idea, something! Give me something!"

Trust was an important technique that grew for each troupe during their nine-month tour and also over the run of the show. As the practitioners' trust in themselves and in the students grew, the programme became more student-directed, which was one of the goals. For example, Fleming's question above shows more trust in the students than the question asked on the first tape, "Shall we tell the Blackfoot?" I do not assume that the students' input was always proscribed by the leaders in the first year, or that the action was always open-ended in the third year, but there is evidence both in the tapes and in the interviews of a growing ability to let the students have some control of the drama. This sense of control enabled the students to feel Committed to the drama: they could go beyond the "Follow-the-Leader" experience the Traders had in the first tape.

The only record of a Press being applied is in the Post Lesson tape of the first year, where the teacher-actor in-role as Crowfoot becomes very angry at the Blackfoot who refuse to sign the treaty. In that instance, it worked very well. Students who were not yet Engaged at the beginning of the Council immediately became Committed and matched her emotion and determination.

There are two examples recorded of a teacher-actor disciplining in-role. The first is in the Pre-Lesson. At this level the students easily fall out-of-role, often expressing their self-consciousness through laughter. Berry disciplines in-role as Crowfoot, saying, "You do not laugh at a time like this!" This approach underlines the dramatic situation rather than the classroom reality. At this point it makes some of them even more uneasy, but she uses the same technique late in the drama when she cuts off an argument by telling the Metis that the Traders are not worth fighting with, and it is very effective. The technique is more successful as students become more deeply Involved.

The practitioners shown in the Progress West tapes are successful with their groups to the extent that they themselves are able to Commit. This is as true in the tape of the third year, where the troupe consists of people who are more 'teachers' than 'actors', as it is in the first year where there is much more 'acting' done by the leaders in the portrayal of their roles. The students only feel safe to Commit if their leader does. The ability of teacher-actors to Commit to their own roles is one of the most important skills they can develop.

RESPONSE

In questionnaires that were distributed to classroom teachers after each performance, 75% responded that "almost all" of their students became individually involved in the role they were playing (Evaluation Report, 14).

> When the teachers were asked if the social interactions among their students during the Drama differed from the interactions normally observed in the classroom or playground, 76% (n=63) of the teachers replied 'yes.' Fourteen teachers commented that 'dominant students became quiet while some quiet students got very involved and took leadership roles.'
>
> (Report, 15)

Most teachers felt that "most student in-role articulation was in the form of simple answers to questions or instructions from troupe members," although 80% said that at least some of their students had given more complex answers to other students or initiated discussion with other students while in-role (Report, 15-16). As the teachers were in the best position to see differences between the participants' in-role behaviour and their usual behaviour, these observations are significant. Many students did take a step into role that teachers recognized as being outside their usual ways of interacting and expressing themselves. 88% of the 394 general comments received from teachers were positive (Report, 17).

88% of teachers questioned in the first year felt that their students came to understand the issues and problems which faced their own group, but only 54% replied that the students understood the problems of the other groups (Evaluation Report, 17). They did feel that the discussion was useful in bringing this understanding about, but the Metis, for instance, who had been deeply Committed, often had trouble withdrawing from the role to see any other perspective. Because depth of Involvement should not become a problem in debriefing, the troupe addressed this when they restructured their debriefing techniques in the second and third years.

The members of the troupe felt that the programme was a success, and that they achieved their objectives. Almost all students demonstrated Commitment to role through interacting physically and verbally with other students and with the teacher-actors. Many did speak spontaneously and take responsibility for actions within the drama. They began to think about how the people involved in the historical situation must have felt. The tape of the post lesson shows that one week later students were still Reflecting on the experience and were ready to go right back into it or step back and Evaluate it. In fact, Berry says that several years later, high school students would come to her to tell her how much the experience had meant to them (Berry, 1991).

CHAPTER FOUR

AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT IN ANALYTIC PARTICIPATION

Because Rap It Up involves its audience in a different way than does Progress West, I modified the terms I used to discuss it, although the basic categories are similar to the previous model.

MODEL #2: LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT IN ANALYTIC PARTICIPATION

1. INTEREST: as in Model #1, this is the essential first step.
2. ENGAGING is broken into two categories which more closely define the process in this form of participation:
    a) IDENTIFYING: the audience member feels empathy with the central (animating) character, and understands the situation being presented.
    b) DESIRE TO INTERVENE: the audience member wants to help the central character and/or to rectify the situation being presented, but does not yet have the opportunity to do so.
3. WILLINGNESS TO RISK: willingness to take risks non-verbally, vocally, collectively and/or individually in order to act on the Desire to Intervene lets the drama proceed and deepens audience involvement into Committing.
4. COMMITTING: the audience member accepts responsibility for resolving the dramatic situation and helping the character(s). The Willingness to Risk grows as a result. Committed audience members will be eager to give realistic suggestions and determined to have their ideas tried, or will be supportive of those who have contributed.
5. REFLECTING: the individual finds aspects of the situation presented to be relevant to their own situation.
6. EVALUATING: the participant weighs the value of the experience in terms of their own situation and decides whether to apply any of the tactics used in the drama to their own life.

I discussed the terms of the Full Participation Model with three Canadian practitioners of Popular Theatre and TIE. Jan Selman and Jane Heather were both associated with Catalyst Theatre in its early years, and Julie Salverson is the founder of Second Look Theatre in Toronto. Because all three have used Analytic Participation in theatre, they were able to give practical input from their own experience.

Although the model is laid out in a linear fashion, an audience or individual audience member will not necessarily progress in sequence from level 1 to level 7. A person may come in with a Willingness to Risk (level 4), or they may never feel ready to risk participating vocally, yet they will be very Interested and will Reflect a great deal on what they have seen (level 6). Also, these elements can extend before and after the performance: Interest is built through publicity and information sent ahead to the participating community; Reflecting and Evaluating will ideally continue long after. As with Full Participation Drama, Analytic Drama programmes can be structured in many ways. For instance, participation may be structured so that the audience guides a scene from a beginning point to an ending by coaching the actors in what to say or do next, or the scene may be replayed several times with the audience suggesting how it could be changed each time. Reflecting and Evaluating may be included in the action of the scenes, they may be facilitated in a post-performance discussion, or they may be encouraged in questionnaires distributed after the event.

DISCUSSION OF TERMS IN THE MODEL

INTEREST

Practitioners must awaken the audience's Interest in the topic, the situation presented and in the characters for Analytic Participation to work. The setting is crucial: the audience must be made aware that a theatre event is about to take place, but that it will be unlike other theatre events they have seen. Heather says, "The first thing you do is you set up a space that is not what audiences expect and where the division between those who will perform and those who will not perform is blurred" (Interview, May 31, 1991). Often this is done by having the actors out-of-role at the beginning of the show to greet and chat with the audience. Salverson notes that because the Second Look show *What's Wrong With This Picture?* progressed to a point where audience members would actually come onstage, the troupe began by having the audience participate in active theatre games.

As with Full Participation, enjoyment is an essential element, and practitioners often encourage a sense of fun. Although Salverson addresses serious issues in her work (as do Heather and Selman) she likes to approach a topic with "a sense of lightness.... You take it seriously, but you're not so serious" (Salverson, Interview, June 15, 1991). Enjoyment helps people feel comfortable enough to begin to Engage in the experience.

It is important to inform the audience about what will be expected of them as the show progresses, including the rules that will set the limits of their participation and keep the participation safe. Selman considers this to be an ethical rule as well as a functional step. Their role can be demonstrated to them by means of a simple and entertaining example: in Heather's play, High Stakes, the audience participates by applauding if they approve of decisions the characters make, so at the beginning of the show they are asked to clap to show their preference for Pepsi, Coke or Coors. Heather says, "What you're communicating to them is that it's not risky, you're not going to ask them to jump up and become a coffee percolator."

IDENTIFYING

This is the first step of Engaging in this Model: since the audience members do not take on roles themselves (at most they step into roles already defined by the actors), it is important that they see themselves in the characters and the situations. Selman says that, "you often see (Identifying) in a nod, looking at the person they're with, because they both have that problem in common" (Interview, August 29, 1991). Practitioners must build upon this impulse as the show progresses. Identification at first takes place on an individual level, but as people become aware that others are feeling the same way, they begin to Identify with the show together, and to sense that they are a group. The more experience the audience shares in the issues being addressed by the play, the more effectively points of Identification can be hit. For this reason, this type of participatory theatre is usually done for a fairly homogeneous audience who share an issue, for example, street kids or single parents.

DESIRE TO INTERVENE

This is the second step of Engaging in Analytic Participation. The audience members' Identification with the situation and the characters leads them to want to intervene when things go wrong. Practitioners must use different strategies to awaken Identification and Desire to Intervene in different audiences. Selman says that she has done a show with single mothers who "responded very well to a character needing help, being very raw emotionally." In contrast, prison audiences were turned off by this approach, seeing it as weakness. They were moved to take part when they saw a character angry and ready to fight. Practitioners must recognize that different people respect different things and be able to work with that:

> We're looking at the social norms of the audience: what's appropriate communication style and what builds respect; how will the audience respect the person? If I'm a single parent and I see you the character in pain that I recognize, I respect you because I see you going through something that I went through, whereas someone else may see you as a whining victim. (Selman)

WILLINGNESS TO RISK

The Desire to Intervene must be supported by the structure of the show and by the performers so that audience members will become Willing to Risk offering their opinions and experience when they begin to deal with situations requiring analysis. Therefore, participations are often interspersed through a show in growing levels of complexity and emotional intensity, from ones requiring non-verbal or group responses to complex ones with no 'right' answer where people must share and sort through their differing opinions. The audience must feel supported but also challenged, and their Interest must be maintained. There are many different strategies practitioners can use to work toward this level. Heather lists some for making the first step from Desire to Intervene to Willingness to Risk:

> You can make it so outrageous that people will spontaneously say, "No, stop it! That's horrible!" More often, you're going to either have the Host say, "Okay, let's hold here, this person's in trouble," or, if you're doing character-based animation, to turn out and say, "I don't know what to do here."

Strategies Selman uses throughout a show are: changing the pace, the rhythm, even the 'rules' (for example, allowing the audience to interact with a character other than the one they expect to). She stresses the importance of maintaining dramatic tension and theatrical energy: if a character wants to confront their boss, it is much more effective if the audience has to hold them back to tell them how to do it effectively than it would be if the character merely discussed doing it sometime in the future. Audience members will become most Willing to Risk at the emotional 'hot point' of the scene, if it has been well chosen and set up.

COMMITTING

Audience members are pushed to Committing when they work at the edge of their knowledge. Selman points out that it is important at first to achieve Identification and to give them positive feedback by letting them work with problems where solutions come to them easily,

> but you need to go up to a point where the audience is truly and deeply challenged, and that is by finding the edge of, "I sort of have an idea, but I really don't know-," ...and then people are excited by the risk, if they're brought there carefully and comfortably. And also, there's a great sense of accomplishment they feel if they and others in the group together got past what they knew at the beginning of the scene or the play by talking

together.

Committing is shown within the audience by heightened attention, spontaneous response to a character's actions ("No, don't do that!"), and by treating the situation as if it were a real crisis. They will be determined to express their ideas and will challenge a character to continue to work on the problem when the character is expressing frustration or despair. People will be willing to draw on personal experience, to express emotion, to stand up for what they believe in, and finally to "leave the characters, the actors, out and talk with one another" (Selman). Jane Heather says,

> Hopefully, you're moving to where the audience wants to take over the show. And to me, that's when you start to get to some of the real aims of doing participation: when you get two people in the audience who don't agree with one another, who have different points of view, who are willing to talk to one another. That's where you start to see the community being created.

At this point, the audience members themselves have taken responsibility for the drama and for the analysis of the issues presented.

REFLECTING

Practitioners encourage Reflecting within the show by blocking easy answers so that the audience must look more deeply. A character may try a suggestion which only partly works, or they may tell a story about what happened 'the last time' they tried that. After an audience member has made an offer, the Animator can "draw out more of what this intervention is about. (The audience member) might want to say, for example, 'Yes, well, this happened to me the other day-.'" (Salverson). This shows that the person is applying the dramatic situation to a real situation, which can encourage others to do the same. In instances where a scene is replayed a number of times, audience members must Reflect in order to think of new strategies to try.

Post-show discussions in large or small groups can also be used to give people an opportunity to Reflect. With Rap It Up, AADAC used a questionnaire developed by its Research and Development Branch to encourage people to Reflect. Some of the questions centred around how true to life people felt the show was and how much they thought it would help them to communicate within their family. Much Reflecting takes place after the audience has left the performance, and often practitioners hear about it only through chance anecdotes, such as one told to Julie Salverson regarding a scene in What's Wrong With This Picture? where one character tries to persuade another to use a condom:

> I remember a woman who said she'd seen the condom scene, then she was on a date and got into the same situation. The guy said the very same lines, and she said, "I kept laughing, because it was just like the play." So that's really tangible. It doesn't happen every day, but it happens.

EVALUATING

As audience members work through the play, coaching characters as to how to deal with the situations in the scenes, they test strategies and try again, and listen to stories of each others' experiences. This process may lead them to Evaluate the input in terms of its potential effectiveness in real life. The comments or suggestions they give may indicate how this experience will affect the strategies they use in similar situations. In a post-show discussion, they may work on this as a group or individually. Evaluating takes place after the action is over, when people have had a chance to Reflect and can make some long-term decisions.

The ultimate indication of Evaluation is if audience members really do make changes in their lives based on what they learned in the show. Input on this is almost always anecdotal, although AADAC's Research and Development Branch counts 'determination to change' as a fairly accurate indicator that change will take place (based on their work with recovering addicts). Although practitioners feel that to some extent they must rely on faith that people will find their work helpful, they express satisfaction in the type of feedback they do get:

> I don't think you change the world in that everybody's lives are changed by a theatre performance, but I think that shifts can happen, the sense of, "Oh, there's another possibility.," the sense that you've got a choice....And I do see that a lot. I see it and I hear it....You do hear some success stories.
> (Salverson)

CHAPTER FIVE

CASE STUDY OF RAP IT UP

I directed Rap It Up in September 1990 for AADAC. Because of my immediate involvement with this project, my method of doing the research and my manner of discussing it is somewhat different. In this chapter, I will draw on my own experiences as well as interviews with the cast and others involved. I will also use information from questions which I asked to be included on AADAC's audience response questionnaires (published in Educational Theatre In Action: The "Rap It Up" Project, by Z'Anne Harvey-Jansen [AADAC, March 1991]), and from Focus Groups which were conducted by Caroline Howarth and myself with members of two audiences near the end of the tour (November 27, 1990), the results of which were interpreted with the assistance of Harvey-Jansen.

Rap It Up is a participatory show intended to help adolescents 10 to 14 years old and parents strengthen their communication skills. It is revue-style, with participatory scenes interspersed with songs and non-participatory sketches. The participatory scenes were written for the project by Jane Heather. Some scenes are adapted from a Catalyst show called Talk is Cheap which toured in 1982/83. Original songs were written for Rap It Up by Jan Randall. Because the 1990 production was a pilot, we experimented with the participatory segments of the show, both in rehearsal and throughout the tour. Adjustments were made to participation structures and to the actors' tactics in order to help bring the audience experience in line with our goals. I will look specifically at some of these adjustments and why they were made.

I began designing the participations in consultation with Jan Selman before rehearsals began, and continued through the rehearsal period with the help of participation workshops led by Selman, along with the input of writer Jane Heather, actors Patricia Drake, Glen Gaston, Earl Klein, David Russell and Stephanie Wolfe, and Stage Manager Jill Cross. The company worked with Selman and Heather to develop the skills and techniques needed for this kind of participatory theatre. These techniques were applied to each scene and developed through rehearsals and presentations for test audiences until each participation seemed to be accomplishing its objectives.

THE PRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

Unlike Progress West, Rap It Up did not follow one story or develop one set of characters. The scene order took the audience from the level of one-word answers to in-depth discussion of a difficult topic. Light scenes were used to introduce the techniques of participation, and more challenging problems were introduced with each one. Rap It Up was structured so that each participatory scene would challenge the audience to work at a deeper level of Involvement. These scenes, with the intended levels of Involvement, are:

> Just a Minute: Interest, Willingness to Risk at a very low level
>
> Public/Private and Emotional Orchestra: Interest, Identification, Willingness to Risk at a slightly higher and group level

Communication Blocks: Interest, Identification, Desire to Intervene, Willingness to Risk at a higher individual level

Dad's Rehearsal/Daughter's Wish: Interest, Identification, Desire to Intervene, Willingness to Risk, Reflecting

Model Boy: Interest, Identification, Willingness to Risk, Committing and Reflecting

Tough to Talk: All of the above at a high level

There was a non-participatory scene near the beginning and end of the play. The first scene, a mother and son "Wrestling Match," introduced people to the themes of communication and established a light-hearted atmosphere. It was intended to awaken Interest and Identification. The final scene, "Values Clash," summarized the themes by using a tug-of-war to show ways people deal with the struggle between teens wanting freedom and parents wanting control. It encouraged people to continue Reflecting and begin Evaluating by taking them a step back from the highly emotional Involvement they had just experienced with "Tough to Talk".

There were four songs which commented on the themes and provided a break from participation.

AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

Rap It Up began building Interest in its intended audience through publicity. Posters and flyers were circulated to the participating communities through the local McDonald's restaurants and AADAC offices. On the poster, the show is described as being "interactive, because it lets you get involved in a fun, relaxed way that's great for opening the lines of communication." People took their first Risk simply by coming, knowing that the event was to be participatory. As Stage Manager Jill Cross observes, "I doubt if anybody knew what to expect. Who knows what participatory drama is?" (Interview, Aug. 31, 1991).

Each performance opened with the actors out-of-role, greeting the audience. In this way, they could awaken Interest, relax the audience, and blur the boundaries between 'those who will perform' and 'those who will not perform.' AADAC had requested a head count by age group. The actors led into the show with this, handling it with a sense of fun, and afterward they congratulated the audience on how well they had done in their 'first participation.' One woman in the Focus Groups mentioned that this had been helpful to her in making her feel it was safe to take part: although we had not planned it, the head count was the first low-risk, nonverbal participation. The actors successfully used it to build a bridge between themselves and the audience.

A short, upbeat opening sketch and a lighthearted rap song was followed by an improvisation game called "Just a Minute." Audience members called out topics that parents and teens disagree about, and each actor talked on the subject for one minute without pause or repetition, at first separately and then at the same time. This was the first time that audience members were called upon to participate individually and vocally. The actor leading the game encouraged the audience to call out a number of topics quickly, getting many people involved while still keeping the game moving. This gave a number of people a chance to take a small Risk, and built the Interest of the others. It also showed that while the audience could be called upon to take small risks, the performers were willing to take much larger ones.

A funny, non-participatory scene followed which treated an argument between a mother and her son as a wrestling match. Parents in the Focus Groups named this as a scene which they Identified with strongly. After that was a song called "Listen," which demonstrated the difference between talking at each other and listening to each other. In the following scene, "Public/Private," two actors played a mother and a son arguing about whether he can borrow the car. Two others played the "Inner" mother and the "Inner" son, who expressed how the two characters were really feeling. A Conductor came forward at the end of the scene, and asked the audience to identify an emotion being felt by each character, Inner and Outer. Each actor created a sound and movement to express the emotion, and the Conductor led them in an "Emotional Orchestra." The Conductor then broke the audience into groups (in their seats) and asked each group for a word or phrase that expressed what one of the characters was feeling. He led the groups to say their word or phrase loudly or softly, blending them into the elements of the "Emotional Orchestra". The objectives of the game were to build a sense of community and of fun, and to clarify and analyse the emotions behind the confrontation in "Public/Private". This was the first point in the show where the audience had to take some Risk collectively, overcoming reticence about being vocal and joining in groups with strangers. It was also the first point where they were called upon to analyse what they had seen. As in Progress West, the company had to learn how to tailor their approach to each specific audience. In cases of very small audiences, they decided not to use the part where the audience becomes the Orchestra. Actor Earl Klein explains:

> It was foolproof, because it was safe for the audience. They could act in a group, so they could be outrageous, and they were. It was a well-structured idea to put in something low-risk that they could grab hold of and go with right away....There were a couple of places where houses were really small that it didn't work. In that case it became high-risk for the audience, because they had to make fools of themselves in a small group and be divided up even further. I mean, the difference between seven people shouting something at you, and seventy, is phenomenal. It's a real difference, and I'm glad we made that decision.
>
> (Interview, Sept. 5, 1991)

"Emotional Orchestra" was immediately followed by a scene called "Communication Blocks", in which a Host fielded suggestions as to how a harried onstage family could make time to talk and listen to each other. The teaching objective was for the audience to identify and name blocks to communication. The end of the scene was replayed several times, each time with the changes that had been suggested. This participation was designed to awaken the Desire to Intervene, and to challenge audience members to be Willing to Risk verbally and individually. It was their first chance to shape the action as they controlled the versions of the scene, clearing away the blocks, and finally seeing it 'work.'

Because the scene was farcical while presenting a serious problem, there were several problems in presentation. It took time and experimentation for the actors to decide to what extent they should edit silly audience suggestions or go with them. The scene seemed to elicit light responses, and the actors became frustrated about trying to use the participation to make pedagogical points. Glen Gaston, who acted as the host, felt that it worked best when the cast stopped trying to direct the participation and accepted anything the audience gave them. The actors chose to encourage the Desire to Intervene by making it clear that the audience held the responsibility for the scene:

> The more we tried to impose a shape, the less steam it gathered. It finally worked when I just took a whole bunch of suggestions right away and I said, "Try this.," and gave it to the family and they would play them out exactly. It would either work or it would be such a mess that the audience would go, "No, no, no, no!" They would be able to see it.
> (Interview, August 9, 1991)

The actors also had to work with the way that the characters were portrayed. Since the teenage daughter is the first to demand a change in their stressful lifestyle, it is natural to assume that she is the protagonist and the parents are the antagonists. If the parents' feelings were not played strongly and with some realism, the real parents were not Willing to Risk participating whole-heartedly, suspecting that they were being set up as bad guys. Eventually, the company was able to retain the scene's farcical edge while giving some legitimacy to the parents' concern that their daughter continue cello lessons even though her life was busy. The daughter's frustration with her overcrowded schedule remained legitimate, but the actor playing her introduced some childish tactics into her argument. Although the problems with the scene and the participation were not completely solved in this tour, audience members in a Focus Group conducted two months into the tour responded positively. The serious issue was clear, and they did not see the problem as being the fault of only one party. They Reflected afterwards on what it meant to them:

> I liked it. It shows you have to be determined to have communication, put aside all distractions, and give your family priority.
>
> (Mother)

> I really liked the participation because you got to put your ideas to work. I liked to see the same moment played over with different suggestions from the audience, because you could really see how your ideas were working.
>
> (Mother)

> The scene...was good because it showed things kids do wrong and also that parents should shut up and listen sometimes. Neither kids nor parents will admit when they are wrong.
>
> (Daughter)

"Communication Blocks" was followed by "Wimpy Folks," a funny song about parents who have given up trying to guide or discipline their children, and then by "Dad's Rehearsal, Daughter's Wish," which showed a girl and her father on her first day of junior high. The daughter had monologues which highlighted some of the pressures on girls regarding image, sexuality and peer pressure. The father's monologues reflected on similar experiences he had had as a boy starting junior high. Each of them wanted to talk to the other about the things she would encounter in junior high, but they did not know how, and by the end of the scene it was time for her to go. The action was stopped as she was about to leave, and a host asked for suggestions for one thing the two could say to each other before she went. The objective of the participation was to encourage the audience to look for effective things people can say to each other when there is only a moment to make contact. Stephanie Wolfe, who played the daughter, says that she felt uncomfortable acting as though the characters could deal with their fears in only one sentence after they had spent so much time talking about them in the monologues (Wolfe, Interview, Sept. 17, 1991). The troupe wanted to keep the participation brief without losing the audience Identification which the scene had earned, so they turned it into a short conversation between the two, with coaching from audience members. They maintained the sense of urgency but let the audience explore the characters' feelings a little more. The host would begin the participation, and then the characters would take over, asking for help directly when they got to a point where they could not find words for what they wanted to say. This approach Engaged a full cross-section of the audience. Men and women, adults and teens all wanted to Intervene. Glen Gaston, who played the Dad, discovered how to Engage the audience through character need:

> There were real moments of crisis for me as a character going, "This is not working! This is just not working! I don't feel good and I know she doesn't feel good. What do I do?," and the more I played with that sense, the more the audience came around, saying, "Okay, you've got to calm down." They really felt the urgency for me....Instead of pat answers, (they gave us) things that we could really use then and later on.

When played this way, the scene served as an introduction to character animation of the audience (where the characters speak directly to the audience to ask for help, rather than having a host act as a go-between). This was used fully in the next scene, "Model Boy". In it, a thirteen year-old boy receives a phone call from a girl who invites him to a school dance. It is the first time this has ever happened, and he is not sure how to respond. He tells her 'no,' but after the call he has second thoughts. His father knows something is bothering him and wants to talk about it, but cannot find a way to approach the topic without making the son uncomfortable and defensive. The objective was that the audience would share suggestions as to how fathers and sons can talk about issues of gender and sexuality in an age-appropriate way.

Although it never fully achieved this objective, this participation was one of the most successful. As the boy contemplated going out with a girl instead of the usual group of boys, the scene examined the changing social orientation that is very important to adolescents, and because of that it Engaged all segments of the audience. Of all the scenes, this one generated the most discussion and debate. At times the audience members would talk about it amongst themselves as well as addressing their comments to the characters. When this happens, the audience takes responsibility for working out what they feel is important. It is one of the most challenging forms of audience Commitment for the actors to manage, as they must maintain enough control to keep things on topic and get back into the scene when the time is right without cutting off valuable interaction. Debate most often focused around whether the father should talk about his own early dating experiences, and whether the son should lie to the girl in explaining why he could go, after all (so that he would not have to admit to her that he said 'no' because he was scared). People were often emotional in their opinions, and were Committed to sorting out the problem. When adults in the Focus Groups Reflected on this scene, they said that this participation made them decide they should be careful about using personal stories when talking to their children; they had noted from the response of teens in the audience that "some kids like hearing about their parents' experiences at that age, and some don't." The teens who did not feel the father should talk about his experiences were often emphatic about it.

Identification was high with this scene. Cross says that young people would often respond in the first person, such as, "Yeah, I've got a girlfriend, and my friends did that trip on me," or, "My friends don't care." Girls often worked to convince the character that the girl would be happy rather than angry if he told her he had changed his mind. Focus Group members referred to this scene when they were asked to name one that was similar to what they had experienced in their own families.

"Model Boy" worked very well as a scene on its own, but in missing its target topic of gender issues, it meant that the show remained too light too long, and there was not a smooth transition into the final participatory scene, "Tough to Talk", which dealt with an impending death in the family. This resulted in a disturbing jolt in the mood of the show and in the level of risk required in participation.

"Tough to Talk" was about two parents trying to decide how or when to tell their children that the mother's brother is dying. They have put off breaking the news for six months, but now he is in critical condition and may die soon. The adolescent son has picked up on the tension and believes that his parents are getting a divorce. After a direct address to the audience by the mother and the son wherein each gave their impression of the situation, the scene began at a hot point, with the mother having just received a phone call informing her of her brother's condition. She feels they must tell the children now, and take them to see their uncle. The father wants to wait; he thinks they should go to the lake as they had planned and tell them about their uncle there. When the father tries to hide the argument from the children, it fuels their suspicions about divorce. The tension finally builds to an explosive situation where communication breaks down entirely. The parents turn to the audience for help.

The steps of the participation were structured so that the audience would first have to help the parents deal with the effects of having shut their children out and clear up the divorce misconception, then help them discuss the uncle's condition and give the children the support and sense of family unity they need. Animation continued until it reached the point where the family had come together emotionally and were ready to face the crisis and continue talking. In order for it to work, we had to Involve the audience at the levels of Interest, Identification, Desire to Intervene, Willingness to Risk vocally and individually, and Commitment to helping the characters and resolving the situation. It was the final participatory scene; part of the function of the others was to prepare the audience for this.

This scene was the most successful one in creating a feeling of community and solidarity, and Commitment (emotional and intellectual) to resolving the situation. Gaston recalls:

> I always remember being Andrew (the son) and looking out into the audience, and seeing people who were completely there and listening and wanting to help..., and (there was a sense) of, "Oh, this is going to be tougher than we thought, but we're in it for the duration."...They had to solve it in order to save the family. Not in order to deal with the problem, but in order to save the family.

Much of this reaction was due to the actors' ability to show real need in this scene. They handled the characters and the audience input sensitively, and people responded to that. Audience members became Willing to Risk at a level they had not previously reached because they felt they could trust these actor/characters with their personal feelings and stories.

Many audience members showed that they were Reflecting, talking about their own experiences and listening to each other. Cross feels that this scene really Engaged the adults as well as the young people:

> (Adults) were very sharing. They would share personal experiences, and they weren't so uptight (as they were through the rest of the show) about being wrong or having a different opinion. It wasn't like they put on their 'parent' hat; they realized that they had a role to play and something to contribute....The parents respected the teens because they came up with such lucid, practical, well thought-out answers. I think that was very educational to the parents because it showed they could learn from their kids, that their role isn't just teacher/counsellor. I think it really fulfilled some of the very basic objectives, which were to empower both groups, a more equal sharing of power, a development of a more respectful relationship.

It was common in this participation for adults and young people to tell personal stories, usually Reflecting on the effect a relative's death had had when the family tried to keep the knowledge from them.

Another reason the scene worked was because the hot point was very hot and the issue of dealing with death clearly important. The playwright's subtext was that the brother was dying of AIDS, and in cases where the audience wanted to know what the brother was dying of, this came out and was dealt with directly. At times when AIDS came up, audience Commitment intensified:

> The thing that made it really valid to be about AIDS was not about us doing AIDS education, but about taking a scene that was tough for the audience and making it much tougher. When it was clear that we were talking about AIDS, I could feel from the audience a heightened sense of concern. They really had to challenge their own belief systems. It took it to a place where they couldn't be idle observers. I think a lot of people, when they realized it was about AIDS, went, "This isn't granny dying of old age. Granny dying of old age is a natural consequence of life, it's easy. This is a more complex question."
>
> (Klein)

People responding to the scene in the questionnaires and the Focus Groups said they felt it was very real. Many used these forums to Reflect on the scene, sharing personal stories and expressing a strong belief that young people should be included in serious family situations, even when it is something that is difficult for parents to talk about.

The show ended with a short scene called, "Values Clash", which contrasted different ways of sharing responsibility between parents and adolescents, followed by a reprise of the "Rap It Up" song. These gave the audience a chance to disengage from the high level of emotional Involvement in "Tough to Talk", so that they could begin to Reflect on the experience of the show.

HOW STRUCTURE CONTRIBUTED TO AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

Although Rap It Up was structured so that each participatory scene would take the audience as a group to a deeper level of Involvement, there was room for individual Interest and Involvement to peak at various times according to personal feelings of connection with each situation or character. Cross, who saw every performance, feels that people tended to participate most in the scenes that contained a person or an issue that was important to them. According to her, girls participated most in "Communication Blocks", which had a teen female central character, boys and men began to participate more actively in "Model Boy", and many adults would become most Involved in "Tough to Talk".

The actors felt that the structure worked for them in guiding the audience into deeper Involvement, although the level of challenge in the participations could have been escalated more quickly. Adults often came in with the idea that the participation was 'for the kids', and that they shouldn't interfere. The actors' job might have been made easier if "Dad's Rehearsal, Daughter's Wish" had come before "Communication Blocks" rather than after. This would have introduced a level of emotional Engagement sooner, as these characters were more realistic than the stressed-out family in "Communication Blocks". Also, the "Dad's Rehearsal, Daughter's Wish" participation was technically simpler than the one it followed, which may have led people to believe the show was going to continue at a level aimed at adolescents.

The structure was intended to provide a succession of scenes that were gradually more serious as well as more challenging. In performance, however, the "Model Boy" scene and the song "Too Many Faces" became quite light, creating a jolt when the audience was suddenly faced with the issue of death in "Tough to Talk." The "Model Boy" scene worked very well on its own as an examination of dating and social pressures, but in avoiding its intended issue of sexuality, it did not fulfill its function of introducing weightier problems into the show. Finally, after the high emotionality of "Tough to Talk", one more scene would have helped the audience relax into a more Reflective mood.

The Focus Groups, conducted immediately after some performances, provided an opportunity for people to share Reflection and begin Evaluating away from the show itself. People would have benefitted if this could have followed each performance, but in many areas this was not feasible.

HOW PERFORMERS' TECHNIQUES CONTRIBUTED TO AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

Some techniques can be used by performers throughout a show to continue deepening Involvement, whereas others are used at specific points, when the audience is at a certain level of Involvement. Part of the troupe's training focused on developing skill in participatory techniques. During rehearsal, the actors worked on methods for welcoming input and drawing out suggestions from people, blocking to deepen a suggestion by adding complications, storytelling to block and deepen a suggestion, checking in with the audience to make sure they are accurately following a suggestion, and summarizing suggestions so that the whole audience hears and understands. All of these techniques help the audience progress to deeper levels of Involvement as they feel challenged and satisfied that their suggestions are being welcomed and used. During the tour, the actors developed their skill in these tactics and found new ones of their own.

Stephanie Wolfe says that each actor developed a distinctive participation style. For example:

> Earl was very nourishing to the crowd. He was very good at kind of massaging them into talking to him. My style in that show was to joke and provoke. Glen was very trustworthy and instructional. You could trust him there. Patty had a real needing quality. She really invited them to help her.

She notes that their styles depended in part on the type of participation they were involved in. She was working with the audience early in the show, when the major task was to show them that participating was fun and that the actors were likeable. Her techniques of 'joke and provoke' were effective in awakening early Interest and Engagement. Patty Drake's needing quality was useful later in the show when it was important to create a sense of urgency and deep Commitment to the emotional circumstances.

A valuable technique for building Interest early in the show is to gather many suggestions quickly. "Just a Minute" gave the actors an opportunity to do that, as did "Communication Blocks." Gaston remembers getting as many suggestions as he could, "repeating them so that they know you've heard. Then you'd start the ball playing between you and the audience. And the faster we'd use the suggestions, the more they'd get off on it."

Looking out to the audience to check with them or challenge them while one of their suggestions was being improvised kept Interest high all through the show. It invited them to Commit, as it let the audience know that they were still a part of the action and that they had the right to correct the actors, cheer them on, or offer further advice. Often it led to Engaging on a group level as people would spontaneously call out encouragement or express frustration.

Identification was sometimes encouraged by directly addressing members of a specific group. Klein says that many times when he was playing the father in "Model Boy" he would specify that he wanted 'dads' to advise him about talking to his son. There were often relatively few fathers in audiences of Rap It Up, and this would help to Engage them and build their Willingness to Risk. Once they were directly encouraged, they would usually continue to participate. David Russell, who played the son, used the same technique to encourage participation from teen boys and girls. He encouraged them to share stories from their own experiences. This increased the Identification by teens as a group as they listened to the ones who responded.

In order for people to Desire to Intervene, they had to be convinced that they really were responsible for the way a scene went. In early scenes, the cast did this by playing each suggestion honestly, even if it seemed silly:

> They would appreciate the honest interpretation of what their suggestion was, and then realize, "Oh. Well, if they're going to do that, we really have to help them." They had a stake in it because we were playing it out just the way that they said it. They'd see you in trouble if it went wrong, and if it worked, they'd go, "Oh good, we made a great suggestion."

Thanking people for their help was a way to acknowledge the audience's power and encourage their Desire to Intervene and Willingness to Risk. In later scenes, Desire to Intervene could be encouraged by the sense the actor gave that the character really needed the audience. In "Model Boy" and especially in "Tough to Talk", where a family member had died, the characters treated the audience as confidantes in a time of crisis. This approach was very effective in making people want to help the characters and rectify the situation.

In many performances, audiences became emotionally and intellectually Committed during "Model Boy." The actors encouraged Commitment by getting a lot of suggestions so that differences of opinion could come out. They blocked and challenged some of the responses by telling stories about the last time they had tried that, and they kept the emotional level high. The danger with this approach was that in some performances, too many opinions were sought and discussed before any action was taken on them. In these cases, some Interest was lost.

In performances where "Model Boy" worked well, audiences became Committed to the following scene, "Tough to Talk", almost immediately. Even when the previous scene did not go well, they very quickly became Engaged. The topic of talking about death in the family and the emotional hot point that the scene started at pulled people in very strongly. The audience was truly pushed to the edge of their knowledge. The characters expressed frustration, despair, and confusion. They were truly grateful for the audience's help, and people responded to that. The actors made them feel needed. They used stories to bring up issues that the audience may have missed, and they accepted stories from the audience with understanding. This scene was very successful, and people actively Reflected during and after it.

Most of the training and rehearsal of the actors was done with audiences of 60 or more in mind. Through the tour the actors had difficulty encouraging participation when houses were small. As Jane Heather pointed out after attending a show on tour, actors need to be taught how to 'see' a small audience. In the performance she saw, the cast had trouble getting responses early in the show, yet they often did not see hands that were raised tentatively, so they missed the opportunity to encourage individuals who were thinking about responding. This affected the rate at which people became Involved in small houses, although it did not seem to affect the level of their Involvement in the final scenes.

The actors' developing ability and their refinement of the participations made a difference in the audience experience. Harvey-Jansen points out that as the tour progressed, the questionnaire results became more and more positive, especially in the audience ratings for enjoyment of the show, value of the show, and enjoyment of the participation (Harvey-Jansen, 10-11).

Overall, the actors' techniques worked very well in helping people to reach the levels of Involvement that were important to a valuable experience of the show.

RESPONSE

The show was successful in sustaining Interest throughout.

On the questionnaires distributed by AADAC, the show received a positive rating from all age groups and both genders. 92.1% rated the show as "good" or "very good," which was the highest rating. Comments on the questionnaires that alluded to Identification were nearly all positive. The most variation came in feelings about how the adolescents were portrayed:

> Particularly felt you captured the boy beginning to date. My son acts so similar. Very helpful!!
>
> (not identified)

> Some was a bit immature for these ages, 11-14. They are more mature than a lot of the sketches.
>
> (Father)

> All the teenage problems were handled well. I'm sure I will be able to talk to my mom/dad better! Thanks!
>
> (12-14, female)

> It was more a show for parents than kids. We're not half so dumb and confused as you seem to think. It gave me ideas about how to treat my future kids, but not my parents.
>
> (12-14, female)

When asked in a Focus Group how they felt about the way the adolescents were portrayed, some young people said they were too young or "too whiny." These comments reveal a concern that could be addressed if the show were mounted again. 12 to 14 year-olds rated their enjoyment lower than did the 10 to 11 year-olds or the 20 to 39 year-olds, which means that in a subsequent production, more work would have to be done to address this portion of our target audience. However, even among the 12 to 14 year-olds, the majority said they enjoyed it "a great deal" or "quite a bit," with only 4.3% saying they did not enjoy it (Harvey-Jansen, 10). This problem may simply indicate that 10 to 14 years old is too wide an age range, and in a subsequent tour, the show should be adapted to address 10-11 or 12-14 year olds.

Focus Group members felt that the show worked well in terms of encouraging them to be Willing to Risk. They felt safe in the beginning games and were at ease by the time they had to take greater risks.

An audience size of 60 to 200 people worked best in aiding people's Willingness to Risk. Larger audiences increased the likelihood that some people would not have an opportunity to contribute their ideas, as well as allowing the development of alienated or disruptive cliques, while in very small audiences, people felt 'on the spot'.

Willingness to Risk was usually quite high by the time "Model Boy" was presented, and people were intellectually and emotionally Committed by "Tough to Talk."

Reflecting peaked with "Model Boy" and "Tough to Talk." "Model Boy" caused the most dissension in the audience, and "Tough to Talk" brought them together, creating the greatest sense of community. It was important that the show did not end in a way that left people feeling isolated, and "Tough to Talk" succeeded in making them feel supported by each other. One more scene designed to encourage Reflection after "Tough to Talk" would be helpful.

When asked to comment on the show overall, people in the Focus Groups and on the questionnaires responded with comments such as: "We're not alone!" (which occurred on the questionnaires several times), "Hearing such familiar things made me realize it wasn't just happening in my family" (Mother, Focus Group), and "Very effective. Makes you look at your own situation. Should be attended as a family" (not identified, questionnaire).

The questionnaires asked audience members to Evaluate how much they thought the show would help them to communicate better. 48.6% thought that it would. 19.3% thought that it would help them "a great deal," and only 8.3% thought it would not help them. Parents said they will use the ideas more often than did the 10 to 14 year-olds. All of these ratings improved as the tour progressed (Harvey-Jansen, 10-11). Audience members showed Evaluation in some of their comments on questionnaires and in the Focus Groups. The two girls quoted above concerning the portrayal of teens give an example of this; one felt the show would be helpful to her in dealing with her parents, the other said it definitely would not. A mother in a Focus Group made a strongly Evaluative comment:

> The dialogue (in "Wrestling Match") sounded just like me. I hadn't realized what it sounded like until I heard the teen voice. It's true. I don't know why their friends are friends. I guess I'll go home and find out."

Almost all audience members who saw Rap It Up enjoyed it very much and felt it was valuable for them. Almost all audience members experienced all of the levels of Involvement outlined in Model #2. As the tour went on, the company was able to adapt their tactics and the structure of each participation to various audiences so that they could facilitate their Involvement at progressively deeper levels. By the end of many performances, a sense of community had been created, a community where debate and discussion could take place. In a number of performances, people became Committed deeply enough to begin to 'take over the show,' debating among themselves about issues that were important to them, without needing the performers to act as mediators. Most importantly, Rap It Up succeeded as a forum for open, respectful dialogue between parents and adolescents.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

As I looked at Audience Involvement using the models I had developed, I realized that there are many similarities between the forms of participatory theatre in my study, although of course there are obvious differences. In this chapter, I discuss ways in which this study can help practitioners of each form see what there is to learn from the other, especially in the areas of structure, performers' techniques, and the stages of Audience Involvement. I point out the similarities and differences that particularly struck me, and conclude with a discussion of the value of developing and applying these models.

STRUCTURE

The major difference between Full Participation and Analytic Participation lies in the journey that the structure is designed to take the participants through. The object of Full Participation is to take an event that is foreign to the participants and make it familiar to them through in-role involvement so that they can understand it at an emotional level. Analytic Participation often takes an experience that is familiar to the participants and distances them from it by putting it on stage so that they can analyse it. Knowing this can help practitioners decide which form suits their goals best. Full Participation was used in Progress West in order to help the students understand an historical event on a human level. The Analytic out-of-role form of Rap It Up was used to help adults and young people of varied backgrounds explore ways of dealing with problems that they shared.

The choice of form must also be based on the character of the audience. Some audiences will not be comfortable with becoming physically involved in a programme, and will gain more if they can sit apart from it. Others long to be part of the action. The right form will help to ensure optimum Commitment. The conventional wisdom is that Full Participation works best with children, as role play and physical action are so much a part of their natural interaction, and Analytic Participation is best with teens and adults. Although this may be a good guide, there is no need for practitioners to feel tied to it. Catalyst Theatre had good results when they adapted Project Immigration for use with older teens and adults, and Therese Craig has done successful Full Participation programmes with teens. Feeling Yes, Feeling No requires children as young as five years old to analyse the behaviour of characters in its scenes. One reason for the successes of Rap It Up and Progress West was that the forms chosen were good for their respective audiences. In a group that varied in age from ten to forty years plus, Analytic Participation allowed people the safety of remaining a certain distance outside the play, even when they were becoming Committed at a very deep level. For a group of schoolchildren who all knew each other, being in-role meant that they could escape a little from the usual expectations of their classmates.

Audience size is an important factor. Both forms are highly effective with small audiences, but Analytic Participation can also be used with larger ones. Full Participation requires a close relationship between the performers and the participants, and even a fairly small group will often have to be broken up into subgroups. It is important to take this difference into account when choosing a form. For instance, in Progress West, the demands of Full Participation meant that the teacher-actors were alone with their groups for fairly long periods, so it took time and careful planning to ensure that all groups had opportunities to achieve the same levels of Involvement. In Rap It Up, the audience was large, but all members were together throughout the show, so the company could work as a group to keep the levels of Involvement consistent.

PERFORMERS' TECHNIQUES

If the goals and the structure of a programme suit the audience it is presented for, and if it has been publicized properly, then the performers have the final responsibility for Involving the audience. Of course, the audience members themselves have a right to choose to become Involved, and to choose the depth to which they will be Involved; honest participatory theatre must respect this, but the performers must be prepared to convince them that this event is worthy of their Interest and Involvement. In both forms, the performers' own Commitment to their roles is the cornerstone which wins the audience's Commitment. If actors are unwilling to take that Risk, then neither will the participants.

In many cases, stage presence, voice projection, and related technical acting skills are more important in Analytic Participation because of its presentational nature and because it can involve larger groups. In Rap It Up, an ability to be at ease in front of dozens or hundreds of people was essential to Engaging them. In Progress West, the teacher's skills of relating to small groups, asking open questions and making sure that every student spoke were the tools that Engaged the students. Although questioning skills are important in both forms, they were crucial to building Involvement in Progress West.

Performers in both types must be very flexible and open to input if they are to help people to become Willing to Risk and to Commit. Both must be able to give away some of their power as performers and as leaders, since the deepest levels of Committing can only happen if they let the participants lead the action at times. Just as importantly, they must know when to take control again, and have the strength to do that.

They must be able to ask for help, and mean it. They must convince the participants that their input really does matter and does make a difference. For example, the Traders in the Tape #2 of Progress West never believed that they could really do anything, so they didn't. There was nothing for them to Commit to, as it seemed things just rolled along whether they said anything or not. Meanwhile, the Metis were convinced that their input was essential, and passionately acted upon that belief, becoming deeply Engaged and even Internalizing their roles. The teacher-actor leading the group helped this happen by affirming time after time that their comments surprised her, angered her, intrigued her. She reacted as though they were real people with ideas that could help in a crisis, strengthening their belief in themselves. In Rap It Up, audience members who had not participated through the rest of the show suddenly became Engaged when they saw a very deep level of character need in "Tough to Talk."

Specific performer techniques used at each level will be discussed in "Stages of Audience Involvement."

STAGES OF AUDIENCE INVOLVEMENT

INTEREST

This first step is essential in both forms. In both, Interest is awakened through advance information, the choice and use of setting, and by a 'map' of the event which is made clear to the participants early on in the programme. Participants feel more at ease and ready to take part if they have some idea of what will be expected of them.

ENGAGING

This is also essential if either form is to be a theatrical or dramatic experience rather than an illustrated discussion. It involves the participants Identifying with the roles they have or the characters they are watching and the situation being portrayed. In both cases, it is important that the performers Identify with their own roles and support the participants when they begin to risk Identifying. Desire to Intervene, in Analytic Participation, is really a way of being willing to operate 'as if,' which occurs in Full Participation. If audience members are interested in intervening to help the characters in a scene, then they are accepting people and things onstage as if they are real and vital.

A technique which works for practitioners in both forms is the gathering and use as of many ideas as possible from the participants as they begin to Engage. This encourages them to be more Willing to Risk and to Commit.

WILLINGNESS TO RISK

Willingness to Risk is an important part of Committing in both forms. However, as it plays a slightly different role in Analytic Participation, I gave it a separate category in the second Model. In Full Participation, Committing can come about through physical and group activities that do not necessarily involve personal Risk, although it cannot advance very far unless participants begin to Risk. They often become Willing to Risk because they are Committed. In Analytic Participation, the play cannot proceed if people are not Willing to Risk. Perhaps because they are more at a distance, people are often Willing to Risk first, and then, if they are satisfied with what they get from that, they become Committed to the situation.

COMMITTING

The most important technique for practitioners of both forms in encouraging an audience to Commit is to make it clear to them that they have power. One way of doing this is to show a character needing help. The strongest example in Rap It Up was the parents dealing with the death of a family member. In Progress West, it was when Sandford Fleming, leader of the Surveyors, ran out of ideas and desperately asked his team to come up with a plan. In order to create a strong basis for this kind of character need, it is important that dramatic tension be maintained. If it is lost, either form becomes an intellectual exercise at best.

As people become Committed, they need to have opportunities for interaction and debate, at first with the performers and later amongst themselves. Practitioners of both forms struggle with the problem of how open to leave the options. This issue has to be dealt with project by project and even moment by moment. A less Committed group will benefit from having suggestions made, so long as they know that they have the power of choice. A group that is highly Committed to the drama and understands the situation can be unnecessarily limited by suggestions; they can become frustrated and their Commitment will be lost. Open-ended participation has to be limited if the show must fit a set agenda. The limits of audience power must be acknowledged to the participants as well as among the performers.

INTERNALIZING

This is a sense of living the life of the role which can be very exciting to participants, and can lead to deep Reflecting. As it can happen only when the participant is playing the role, I applied it to Full Participation theatre but not to Analytic Participation. However, a deep level of Identification in Analytic Participation can have a similar effect. It is necessary that the performers know how to give support when the participants are Internalizing their roles and how to guide them out of the roles and into useful Reflection.

REFLECTING

In both forms, Reflecting can take place in or out of role, in or out of the drama. One way that performers in the case studies encouraged the participants to Reflect was by encouraging oppositions. In Progress West, this meant encounters between groups with different viewpoints. In Rap It Up, it meant probing for different ideas so that people could discuss them. This worked especially well in "Model Boy".

Pressing and blocking are important techniques throughout a programme, but their effective use is essential here. Heathcote's 'press' is close in practice to the idea of 'blocking' in Analytic Participation. In both cases, the performer shows in a congruent way that the first answers of the participants are a beginning, but not enough: they must search deeper. This can be done through questioning, storytelling, or letting an idea only partly work. It is important to make the participants feel that more is required without implying that their contribution is bad.

In both cases, Reflecting is the process of seeing the events of the drama in a larger context. In Progress West, participants were encouraged to see that the feelings they had in the drama are common to all people. The purpose of Rap It Up was to let people see that others have problems which could feel specific to them, and then give them an opportunity to share ideas for dealing with those problems.

EVALUATING

Practitioners of both forms can encourage Evaluating through questioning and discussion, but in the end it is an individual process that cannot be forced or guaranteed. In Rap It Up, it was encouraged on the questionnaires and, on two occasions, in Focus Groups. Because Progress West ran for three years, the practitioners were able to refine their questioning of participants in- and out- of role in ways that strengthened Reflection, and so, they hoped, would lead to Evaluating. In both plays there is evidence that some people did Evaluate what they had experienced and applied their insights to their own lives.

In Progress West, the children's comments about Native people, and how the 'progress' promised in the drama did not turn out to be progress for them at all, showed that they were Evaluating. Children who had never thought about Indians as anything other than enemies of cowboys began to understand what it was like to be on the other side of the confrontation. In Rap It Up, parents noted with surprise the negative response teens gave to the parent characters who talked about when they were young.

Participation in "Tough to Talk" may have led to Evaluating: in research groups conducted before the tour, parents did not name it as something they needed to talk about with their children, whereas adolescents gave it top priority. In the show, they both stressed the importance of talking honestly about death. A number of people named things they wanted to 'go home and do' as a result of seeing the Rap It Up. This is evidence of Evaluating, but it is for them to decide whether to follow through on it.

SUMMARY: THE MODEL AND ITS USES

The two versions of the model I developed were extremely useful in helping me find the similarities in different types of participatory theatre. They gave me a language to apply to both of the shows I looked at. I used the terms to sort through my observations and impressions and to give clear names to the things I saw happening. This helped me to understand how the excitement of interaction came about in each of these shows. The model was an important tool which I can continue to use as I go on in this work.

The models can be useful to other practitioners as they create, direct and perform in participatory theatre programmes. In some cases they will need to be adapted. For example, if I had been interested in other parts of the participatory experience, such as the ways in which pedagogical points are made and received, I would have developed a model with different terms. In these cases, practitioners may find my work useful as an outline for developing their own model. These concepts are helpful in pinpointing what you want to happen, why, and how. They will add clarity to planning, revision, and evaluation. At the time I directed Rap It Up, I had not yet done this work, and I had to find my way along paths that are now much clearer. Partly this comes from experience, but partly also from the work of sorting carefully through the actions, reactions, and interactions that make people come away from a participatory show saying, "All right! That was cool!" (to quote the kids from Progress West).

In this thesis, I applied terms originally meant for classroom drama to two projects which were from different 'schools' of participatory theatre. Practitioners in these areas need a commonly understood language so that they can learn from each other. In order to increase the possibilities of dialogue, I chose to broaden the use of a vocabulary which has been proposed, rather than developing one more isolated set of ideas.

Although most of the terms were taken from the field of classroom drama, they effectively describe the steps that happened in two theatrical projects. As the case studies show the importance of these steps in building to a satisfying conclusion, the terms can be helpful to theatre practitioners. Practitioners can strengthen their own techniques for soliciting Involvement when they have a clear idea of the steps that are essential in their particular projects, and when they know what techniques are most effective at each level. I believe that these models can be a useful contribution to the work of developing better participatory theatre.

APPENDIX #1

A TAXONOMY OF PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT

Some of the subcategories defined by Morgan and Saxton refer more directly to an open-ended classroom drama than to a TIE programme, as do the final two terms. However, all the terms will be included here for reference as they are printed in Teaching Drama ...A Mind of Many Wonders. A full discussion of each term can be found there.

1. Interest

This refers to those components without which drama cannot take place.

1.1 Attending: Because of the process nature of drama, physical presence is imperative.

1.2 Watching: Evidenced by making and maintaining eye contact.

1.3 Listening: Evidenced by congruent, appropriate, supportive verbal response.

1.4 Reacting: Evidenced by congruent, appropriate, supportive non-verbal response.

2. Engaging

This refers to active identification with imagined roles and situations.

2.1 Acquiescence in being involved: Evidenced by participation in a congruent, appropriate and supportive manner.

2.2 Willingness to engage: Agreement to operate 'as if'; the willing suspension of disbelief.

2.3 Relating: Agreement to accept others, places and objects into the imagined world.

2.4 Identifying: Agreement to endow the role with self, summoning past experience to the demands of the present dramatic situation.

2.5 Evaluating: Satisfaction in the experience.

3. Committing

This refers to the acceptance of personal engagement and responsibility to the work and the group: the initial action of empathy.

3.1 Accepting limits: Acquiescence to the dram framework, bound by the limits of the role and the situation.

3.2 Accepting responsibility: Recognition of the transfer of power to the role, with the attendant freedom to disagree or change directions by

perceiving consequences and implications.
3.3 Empathizing: Emergence of creative ideas expressed through the attitude and concerns of the role.

4. Internalizing

This refers to the intimate interplay between personal feeling and thought and empathetic feeling and thought.

4.1 Organizing, selecting and ordering according to priorities. Refining values, feelings, concerns, beliefs, attitudes and expectations: submitting them to and making them congruent with the role.

5. Interpreting

This refers to contextual selection for clarity of communication and not consciously to create theatre.

5.1 Communicating: Listening, observing, judging effect, predicting other points of view, expressing thought and feeling particular to the role.
5.2 Experimenting: Experimenting with expression (voice, gesture, props, etc.) to discover the one which seems most appropriate.
5.3 Adapting: Being ready to consider other ideas; being ready to consider experience outside the self; being ready to negotiate experience to the needs of the role.
5.4 Analyzing: Being willing to analyze feeling by defending a point of view.
5.5 Reflection: Being willing to operate in the reflective mode through spoken or written work, through graphics, physical action or inner reflection.

6. Evaluating

This refers to the testing out of meaning through consciously working in the art form, whether in class or in performance.

6.1 Dramatizing: Selection of appropriate theatrical elements to enhance thought and feeling.
6.2 Symbolizing: Development of symbolic expression to convey significant meaning.
6.3 Monitoring: Detached observation of the effect of action.
6.4 Re-creating: Evidenced by the revitalizing of the technical past by the feeling present.
6.5 Communicating: Satisfaction in the share significant experience.

(Teaching Drama, 22-28)

APPENDIX #2

Moderator's Guide for the Evaluation of RAP IT UP

Introductions:

Introduce Caroline and myself

Briefly explain what we will be doing:
-discussion group
-show is a pilot: it may be done again next year, so we would like to get some feedback from you that will help us polish it up for the next time we do it

How are we going to arrange the discussion?
-we have some specific topics to talk about
-we value everyone's opinion, hence I will be encouraging everyone to give us feedback

Recording the group's discussion:
-the tape will help us keep a clear record of everything that is said; however, all comments will be kept anonymous

Conduct Focus Group:

Questions

1. What was the main message of the show?
   Tell me about the message
   What part of the show made the message most clear?
   (discuss specific scenes)

2. How did you feel about the participation?
   Did you feel comfortable when the actors asked you for help?
   What did they do that made you feel comfortable / uncomfortable?

3. Is there anything you could suggest for future productions of Rap It Up? -anything you would like to see in the show that wasn't there?

4. Is there anything else you would like the people who designed Rap It Up to know?

Thank you for your help.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnet, David, Erminia Bosio and Stephen Osler. The Black Creek Project. Edmonton: The Catalyst Theatre Society of Edmonton, 1979.

Barnieh, Zina. "Canada, English-Speaking." International Guide to Children's Theatre. Ed. Lowell Swortzell. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990, 33-40.

Benson, Eugene and L.W. Connolly. English-Canadian Theatre. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Berry, Glenys. Personal Interview. 29 April 1991.

Boal, Augusto. Theatre of the Oppressed. transl. Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1985.

Burghardt, Susan. Personal Interview. 23 April 1991.

Chinn, Bill. Personal Interview. 13 January 1992.

Craig, Dr. Therese. Personal Interview. 22 April 1991.

Cross, Jill. Personal Interview. 31 August 1991.

Deverell, Rex. The Copetown City Kite Crisis. Toronto: Playwrights Co-op.

Doolittle, Joyce and Zina Barnieh. A Mirror of Our Dreams: Children and Theatre in Canada. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1979.

Doolittle, Joyce. "Children's Theatre and Drama in English." The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre. Ed. Eugene Benson and L.W. Connolly. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Edmonton Drama In Curriculum Presents "Progress West II". Edmonton: Edmonton Drama In Curriculum, 1982.

Edmonton Public Schools Curriculum Department. Drama-In-Curriculum Evaluation Report 1979-80, 1980.

Filewod, Alan. Collective Encounters: Documentary Theatre in English Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Foon, Dennis. "Theatre for Young Audiences in English Canada." Contemporary Canadian Theatre. Ed. Anton Wagner. Toronto: Simon & Pierre, 1985.

Harvey-Jansen, Z'Anne. Educational Theatre in Action: The "Rap It Up" Project. Edmonton: Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Foundation, 1991.

Gaston, Glen. Personal Interview. 9 August 1991.

Heather, Jane. Personal Interview. 31 May 1991.

Heather, Jane. High Stakes. Unpublished Script. 1991.

Heather, Jane. Rap It Up. Unpublished Script. 1990.

Klein, Earl. Personal Interview. 5 September 1991.

McGregor, Duncan. Participation Plays (Supplementary material for The Snow Queen). St. Catherines: Carousel Players, 1989.

Millar, Scott. Personal Interview. 4 December 1991.

Morgan, Norah and Juliana Saxton. Teaching Drama ...A Mind of Many Wonders. London: Century Hutchinson Ltd., 1987.

Salverson, Julie. Personal Interview. 15 June 1991.

Selman, Jan. Personal Interview. 29 August 1991.

O'Toole, John. Theatre in Education. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1976.

Participation Drama: A Way of Teaching Part 1: "A Teacher Uses Drama to Introduce." University of Alberta, 1981.

Participation Drama: a Way of Teaching Part 2: "Participation Drama, a Dramatic Way to Learn." University of Alberta, 1981.

Participation Drama: A Way of Teaching Part 3: "A Teacher Uses Drama to Summarize". University of Alberta, 1981.

Wagner, Betty Jane. Dorothy Heathcote: Drama as a Learning Medium. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1976.

Way, Brian. "Stretching the Heart." Theatre for Young Audiences. Ed. Nellie McCaslin. New York: Longman, Inc., 1978, 45-63.

Way, Brian. Audience Participation: Theatre for Young People. Boston: Walter Baker Co., Inc., 1981.

Way, Brian. Three Plays for the Open Stage. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd., 1958.

Wolfe, Stephanie. Personal Interview. 17 September 1991.